The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE text of Dr. Leslie Cooke's last annual secretarial report to the Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales before he takes up his appointment as Associate General Secretary of the World Council of Churches became available while this issue was in the press. Much of the report was inevitably of mainly denominational interest, but two passages, the first concerned with relations between the Congregational Union and the London Missionary Society, and the closing section dealing with 'the Church in the World' are printed here in place of our usual editorial comment.

N.M.'s The World at Large will be found in its usual place.

* * *

REPORT TO THE UNION (IN PART)

By LESLIE E. COOKE, D.D.

I SPEAK now of the unfinished task of securing an integration of the Union with the London Missionary Society. Once we seemed to come within sight of it, and then trust in each other, and faith, seemed to fail. It was very soon after I came to office that Dr. Chirgwin invited me to discuss with him the possibilities of a closer relationship between the Union and the Society, and the advisers from our committees who were appointed to counsel us respectively recommended that there were good grounds for seeking such a closer relationship—which was defined by a pamphlet prepared by Dr. Goodall and Mr. Orchard as "Integration." After seven years of discussion we seem hardly nearer integration.

Of course, there are considerable difficulties. The Society is the agent of other Congregational Unions as well as this. It is historically an interdenominational society, recruiting still in small measure resources in money and personnel from other than Congregational sources. Furthermore, there is almost bound to be a large difference in the membership of committees of the Society and the Union because with the limited time available ministers and church members

are not able to serve both bodies with the same devotion. The organization of the two bodies in the country is not co-extensive, the constitutions of the Union and the Society are different, and the methods by which church responsibility is expressed are at variance. There are, no doubt, also certain theological questions involved. None of these difficulties is insuperable. The Union has gone on record that it desires integration—yet we do not make progress. All the time the churches are asked, from a diminishing constituency, to make increased contributions, maintain two administrations separately housed, and to receive separate and often unco-ordinated approaches about their churchmanship, their youth work, children's work, women's work, and so on. Far more serious is the fact that we as a communion of churches—and, for that matter, as a Society —are not responding to the whole changed situation of what has been called Church and Mission in the Church in the world.

The conception of Mission as we have hitherto known it has signified three things. *First,* it signified the response of people in the church who became aware of the responsibility to preach the Gospel to every creature. The church as the Church—in our case the churches as churches—did not at first see that as a total church responsibility. Those who did banded themselves together to form a society to do it. *Second,* it signified the determination of those who had heard and responded to the call to lay it upon the church, or churches, as a whole. That is still an important line of missionary education—that the obligation to the Mission is the responsibility of the whole church. *The third* significance of the missionary movement is that it was a mission. It went forth to alien cultures and heathen peoples to evangelize, to proclaim the Gospel—but in order to do it, it needed the political protection of some colonial Power, and this it has enjoyed.

The situation has changed. The change is due in one sense to the success of the mission. The mission has resulted in the establishment of churches, churches which, as they come to self-consciousness and maturity, seek to move out from the tutelage of the mission to take their place in the comity of churches. The success of the Mission in awakening the Church to its responsibility for the Mission is beyond question. While there are some who may still say they do not believe in missions, and while it will always be necessary for the Church to be kept alive and informed about this responsibility, there is in fact a general commitment of the Church, or churches, to the Mission.

The situation has changed politically. The whole setting of the work of the Mission is altered; indeed, it is an open question as to how much longer we shall be able to continue to send the Mission to the mission fields. The situation is rapidly becoming one in which the only hope will be for the churches to strengthen and sustain the

indigenous, if weak, churches which have been created through the Mission.

Again, the activities of the Mission have raised issues which cease to be missionary in the narrower meaning of that term; they become issues which are the concern of the whole Church; for example, the issues raised in Africa, on Church and education, Church and State, Church and race relations.

All this means that the category of organization, represented by churches acting through a missionary agency, is no longer adequate. These matters are integral, indeed essential, in the life of the Church itself. To apply this to the churches which express their corporate life in the Union of England and Wales means that these great matters should be brought responsibly into the meetings and assemblies of our churches for informed, responsible discussion and decision.

I have longed to see this Union of churches receiving the exposition of the policy of the work overseas, taking clear, responsible decisions to provide the resources for that work as an operation no less serious than the maintenance of the ministry or the provision for widows and retired ministers, receiving the account of the stewardship of those appointed to work in its name, and such an organizational relationship between the two bodies, an integration of the Union into the organization of the Society if you like, as will permit the churches of the Congregational Union of England and Wales corporately to express their calling to Mission. I express the hope that the churches, the County Unions, the Council and this Assembly will so press and urge secretaries and committees until this is done, whatever adjustments are called for in the organization of this Union and the Society. I believe it is what we are being called to do, and I believe when we obey, the churches and the Mission will experience that resurgence of life and liberty which are ever the fruits of obedience.

We can be grateful, however, for certain measures of co-operation which we have taken, but in this realm of Church and Mission, as in other realms of church relations—in the Free Church Federal Council, the British Council of Churches, and the World Council of Churches—we must ever be on our guard lest effective co-operation provides an escape from dealing with those more difficult and intractable questions of integration and unity. In the meanwhile, we may see an illustration of what the relationships of Church and Mission ought to be like in the approach to the problem of Africa.

This is a situation on which the Churches of this country have acted together. While they have had the advice of missionary experts, they took an unprecedented step in sending official representatives to Africa in order that they might be advised as to the best way of action. In the light of these advices, the British Council of

Churches has recommended certain courses of action: first, that we should make an attempt to help the total African situation; secondly, that we should give Church to Church aid; third, that we should support certain independent voluntary religious, educational and welfare institutions; fourth, that we should sustain the work of the Kenya Council of Churches in their work of rehabilitation of the Kikuyu. Within this context our own denomination is invited to take action. The Congregational Union of England and Wales, in consultation with the London Missionary Society, and, we hope, with the collaboration of other Congregational Unions, has evolved a plan of action which will be laid before you—a plan which calls for the giving of service to Africa and for the giving of money. This plan is based on discussions with our brethren in the Congregational churches of Africa and in the missions of Africa. We have no work in Kenya, but we shall acknowledge our responsibility by helping the churches there: we shall take our part in supporting such voluntary and independent institutions as can be maintained. What we have done in a crisis it should be our aim to do with the whole missionary enterprise of our churches, and we must be prepared for such adjustments of organization as may be necessary to do so. We must do it, not because it is expedient, not because it is financially necessary, not because it will remove tension and rivalries in our midst, but because it is becoming clear that it is right that we should, and that to this God is leading us through the events and experiences in the world and in the Church in this 20th century. This is the 20th century, not the 18th.

* * *

It is the privilege and responsibility of the Secretary of the Union to represent our churches in relationships with other churches. So through the years I have had the privilege of sharing in the work of the Free Church Federal Council, the British Council of Churches, and the World Council of Churches. To speak adequately of all that is happening in these realms is impossible now. I content myself with indicating some of the great questions that are being raised by these inter-Church relationships.

It must be immediately said that if these councils were not in being we should have to create them. It is quite impossible for one communion, however strong, to deal with the situation that confronts the Church in this land and in the world. Anyone looking at this complicated scene of church relationships is bound to remark on two features of it.

In this land, the coming into being of the British Council of Churches has raised the great question of what is to be the specific contribution of the Free Church Federal Council. None of us can be content that its contribution should be simply negative. The

close co-operation of the churches in the British Council of Churches at one and the same time throws our disunity into sharper relief and tempts us to avoid the tiresome question of unity.

Many of the Statements received by the Assembly of the World Council and commended to the Church take up a position in advance of that of any single communion; for example, the declaration in the report of the Faith and Order group, "We intend as the Holy Spirit may guide us to unite." It is clear that the local churches have taken great interest in the Second Assembly and, where they have heard it, have responded to its message. If this process continues we may well find local churches pressing their denominational leaders to go further towards unity than many of them at present are willing to go. It is beyond doubt that the World Council is not only exercising a ministry which draws churches into fellowship with each other, it is exercising a prophetic ministry, challenging the churches, and bringing them under the comforts and disciplines of Gospel judgment. On the other hand, it must be recognized that these many organizations of co-operation are making exacting demands upon the time and resources of the churches.

A recent meeting of our Theological Commission concluded that while the denominational organization of this Union or the Missionary Societies are of benefit to the churches, there can be a point where they become a menace. That is the point where their claims for their maintenance exceed their service in sustaining the local church. At that point they begin to sap the vitality of the local church. The same is true of inter-Church organizations. They are a benefit up to that point where they strengthen the witness of the individual communions which constitute them; they become a menace where they begin to make claims for their own sake.

Of these Church Councils, however, we must ask, Is this ministry such that within the fellowship of them the churches may find unity, not for its own sake, but for the better witnessing to and service of the Gospel? When we ask that question we begin to see what is being called for as the next step in the life of the Free Churches in this country. It is a manifest, recognizable unity in witness to the Reformed and Evangelical faith. My colleague and dear friend, Mr. Healey of the Presbyterian Church of England, has ventured to speak about this matter; discussion of it has been taken up in the religious Press; and what was called the Moderator's Commission in the Free Church Federal Council, under the leadership of Mr. Benson Perkins, has raised the matter in the Free Church Federal Council, and has a mandate from that Council to continue its work.

The way forward is not easy. There are theological and ecclesiological difficulties. There are difficulties which masquerade as such but which are far less worthy though more formidable—prejudice, ignorance, conservatism, pride, lack of vision, and the like. I

register my conviction that this matter of a manifest, recognizable unity in Free Church witness is of paramount importance.

There are all kinds of reasons for it, not least, the increasing influence of Rome. How I for one regretted that obsequious capitulation of the Director-General of the B.B.C. to the Roman Catholic protest over the Easter Sunday evening play. I did not see the play, but from all I have read, the interpretation of *St. Mark* on which it was based is surely that which commends itself to the Churches of the Reformed Faith and to all enlightened New Testament scholarship. I think the Director-General should know that his capitulation to the Church of Rome on that was an affront to the Reformed and Evangelical Churches of this land.

A second reason is the squandering of the resources of the Free Churches in dealing with new areas and new towns because there is no central and co-ordinated planning, but the chief reason is that such a *rapprochement* of the Reformed and Evangelical Churches would carry one stage further the cause of Christian unity. It would help those who in the Church of England earnestly long and pray and work for unity in the service of the Gospel.

The position as I see it is this. The present amicable relations we enjoy with our brethren in the Church of England are due in no small measure to the fact that we had to fight that Church on certain issues—for the removal of disabilities and for recognition in the State itself. The Church of England is better, not worse, because of those difficult years, much as we regret the rancour, bitterness and lack of Christian charity which characterized those controversies. The fact is that we do not want to fight the Church of England, even if on certain matters it may be necessary to resist the ignorance and arrogance of a local priest or to represent our conviction on certain subjects, clearly and unequivocally and officially, to Lambeth and York. As far as Lambeth is concerned, and London—I have no experience of York—I want to say that such representations as we have made from time to time have been courteously and understandingly received. We could not expect agreement, at any rate immediate agreement. It has been borne in on me, however, that the next move forward in those relationships is not likely to come except through the creation of a nation-wide fellowship of churches, united although still diverse in their strategy and their proclamation of the principles of the Reformed Faith. The differences in emphasis, ethos, and organization of the Free Churches pale in importance before the overwhelming importance of this.

As the years have passed I have regretted that we did not go further with the Presbyterians. I think our failure was a blow to Church relations in this country. Moreover, such an agreement would have made an impact upon the great Reformed Churches of these islands and of the world. I am glad that in our relationship

we are slowly working out a stronger fellowship, and if we come together to a recognition of the mutual eligibility of our ministers, that will be a significant achievement.

I am sorry that in certain sections of the Baptist communion there seems to be a hardening of attitude, and a preoccupation with fellowship with other Baptist churches, with many of which the British Baptists have in common only the conviction about believers' baptism, and with which they do not share as they do with us the historic experience and conviction of churchmanship. Yet in spite of these difficulties we should persist in patiently seeking this unity of the Free Churches—and I hope Congregationalists will not be disobedient to this vision. God has given us a spirit and a catholicity of mind and temper, even if our organization presents difficulties in the time of action, which equip us to strive and to lead, and it may be He has given them to us for this very purpose. I cannot think that anything that makes for the unity of the people of God in obedience to Christ and service to the Gospel can be contrary to His will. Even if we are rebuffed, even if we are misunderstood, even if we are disappointed—and we shall be—let every Congregational church, let every district and county, let this denomination, return and return again to the initiative in seeking the unity of the churches of this land.

* * *

I have, however, held all along the conviction that such domestic matters as I have spoken about—important as they are—gain their real significance from the background of the unfolding purposes of God in the events of our time.

What has not yet dawned fully upon us is the precarious position in which organized Christianity, the Church, stands in the world. If you put even the fragmentary pieces of evidence together which come to hand, you begin to see. We know, of course, the dramatic events which have put so many races and peoples beneath a political regime which is antagonistic to the Christian faith. My friend Dr. Payne, who recently visited Russia, told me of how one of the Baptist brethren said to him and his colleagues, "Whenever you speak to us, speak a passage of the Bible," and how in that simple request he was made to realize what the proscription of theological and expository writing for nearly 40 years has meant in the life of the Church. In the Eastern zone of Germany, the Church is ever on the alert to guard against subtle moves against it by the political authorities. Some of us recently listened to a vivid description by Howard Schomer of the religious plight of France. Recently a document came into my hands giving account of a journey through the Far East of two representatives of the World Council, with a report of the difficult conditions of the Christian

Church in Indonesia and Indo-China. From India come disturbing pronouncements from time to time which reflect a possible change of attitude to the Mission in that land. On the Mohammedan world the Church has made little impact, and the minority community of Christians, in East Pakistan for example, find themselves in a totalitarian Moslem State unfriendly to them. The situation in Africa is being expounded to us, and the grim realities of that situation brought home. Nor will the significance of events in Belgium and in Argentina with regard to the Roman Church be lost on us. The expansion of the Church in the past 150 years has been checked. The political protection of colonial Powers in which that expansion could take place has been withdrawn. In some places the Mission has established a Church, indigenous to the land and people, but these churches ere they have reached maturity are being called upon to face great trials and tests of their faith and life.

How scandalous our divisions appear in the fact of these great events, how sinful the squandering of our resources and the lack of Christian strategy! What is being called for is the thought of the best minds, and the fervour of blazing hearts, who will think out and carry out in this 20th century what the missionary pioneers did at the end of the 18th century. The great question to be answered is this, "What place is the Church to have in the revolutionized society which the preaching of the Gospel has largely created?" We may say that the present crisis in organized religion is due in no small measure to the fact that the institution which has carried the Gospel across the world has not been prepared for the social changes, the rising up of peoples to claim their freedom and sovereignty and independence which the carrying of the Gospel has created. The judgment of this is written large in our own life. The sort of Independency in which we have believed has been unable and unwilling to adapt itself to the frontier situation it has been called upon to face.

Less violently the revolution takes place in our own land. Some adjustments we have made under the pressures of events and expediency. What is called for is a willingness for us to surrender our institutions to the will of God, to offer our churches, as well as ourselves, without reserve in obedience to His Spirit.

After a somewhat revolutionary and ill-received production, I think in Paris, of the opera *Tristan and Isolde,* Richard Wagner, grandson of the great Wagner, replied to his critics, "The theatre must be contemporary; if it ceases to be contemporary it becomes museum." The same holds true of the Church. To raise a sum of £4,000,000 to preserve our ancient churches is no doubt a laudable purpose. But I regret the significance of it. Churches that are ancient monuments, claiming the ephemeral interest of the tourist "doing Britain," have no appeal for me. I would sooner see them

burned down in the fires of persecution than preserved by a society which cherishes them as of academic and historic interest—like the remains of the temple of Mithras. Yet such will be our fate if we fail to offer ourselves, our institutions, in this hour. And that, not because the truth of the Christian faith is outmoded or denied, but because it is established—not because Christ is dead but because He lives.

THE WORLD AT LARGE

THE primary aim of American foreign policy is to check the spread of Communism, to surrouund and 'contain' the Communist powers, and by any means short of a 'hot' war to liberate the countries captured by the Communists. Our British policy is somewhat less aggressive, but it, too, aims at the prevention of the spread of 'Communism.' This is regarded as in part a political and in part a military question. But it is basically a spiritual issue. We are always being told (very truly) that we have come to a turning-point in human history. The Russian revolution is a symptom, not, as is often supposed, the cause of this. Whence did Karl Marx derive his 'savage indignation' at injustice, oppression, the abuse of privilege, and the exploitation of man by man? Not for nothing was he called 'the last of the Hebrew prophets.' 'Marx' philosophy derives from Hegel, Feuerbach and various other sources, but his indignation comes out of the Old Testament. Partly as a result of the Old Testament which gives the moral passion to Marxism, partly as a result of the spread of liberal and democratic ideas which have their origin in the spiritual valuation of man which came with the New Testament, the whole world is now in turmoil.

* * *

Marxism is frankly anti-Christian, and the secularism of the West is profoundly unspiritual, so much so that both Marxism and 'Capitalism' (except as qualified by moral considerations) may seem to be "the denial of Christianity erected into a system of government"; yet the turmoil of the world is demonstrably due to the Christian Bible, and Dr. Leslie Cooke was fully justified and remarkably brave in telling the supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society at their annual meeting this year that, if they wish to avoid revolution, they had better suppress the distribution of the Scriptures. The Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ was as a flash of lightning; the seething unrest of Asia and Africa is the rumbling of the thunder down the ages. It is possible and not meaningless to see in the world-events of our time the end of the Christian era; they do indeed herald and involve the end of the so-called

'Christian era' of the West; but at a deeper level we should see them as marks of the moving of His Spirit who is the Lord of history.

* * *

The millions of Asia and Africa are drawn to Communism. Why? Certainly not because they have been persuaded by the out-of-date economics of *Das Kapital,* certainly not because they wish to be subservient to the Kremlin or long to be the satellites of Russia. Rather, they are drawn to Communism because in Russia they see, or think they see, the first great experiment in human history to set up an order of society in which there shall be no exploitation of the weak and poor. They are certainly in error about Russia, but there is nothing wrong with their ideal.

* * *

Early in *The Ethics of the Dust* Ruskin in the person of the Old Lecturer speaks of gold and diamonds as "the two great enemies of mankind—the strongest of all malignant physical powers that have tormented our race"; again, "the practical, immediate object of gold and diamonds is the multiplied destruction of souls . . . and the paralysis of wholesome human effort and thought on the face of God's earth." Had Ruskin been living now, it may be thought he would have added oil and perhaps uranium. The industrial revolution in our own country, whatever blessings it has brought, began and continued in an appalling exploitation of the poor by those with capital. There is very much to be said for our Colonial government and even more for the principles that we profess, but what wonder if the natives feel themselves to be exploited in the interest of British dividends! The Union of South Africa, as it seems to us, has committed itself to a policy of frank and acknowledged exploitation. Colonialism, imperialism, white domination, the colour bar—it is against these that Asia and Africa are in revolt. They see in us and in North America the enemy; in Russia they see, or think they see, their friends. Hence they are drawn to Communism.

* * *

They gravely misjudge the Russians and I hope they gravely misjudge us, but I draw two conclusions: first, we should recognize that it is the New Testament or the Spirit of God that is the cause of this unrest, for who taught the world the value and dignity of the human person and the equality of all men before God but Christ Himself? Second, the checking of the spread of Communism is not primarily (but only secondarily) a military matter. We must recognize that the claims of the poorer and exploited peoples of the earth are just, and we must show them by deeds that we will unselfishly help them to the realization of those ideals after which they grope in bitterness and frustration of spirit.

Into the ethical questions of the hydrogen bomb I will not enter here. The hydrogen bomb is a very expensive thing to make. We propose to make these bombs at a cost of I know not how many millions. But since, as I suppose, the Americans have, or soon can have, enough of these horrors to blow the whole world to pieces, there is no possible reason why we should make any more except only to prevent ourselves becoming a satellite of the U.S.A. There can be no doubt that we should do far more to stay the spread of Communism if we gave the money in the form of tractors and fertilizers to the needy folk of Asia and of Africa.

* * *

We are taught by the newspapers and the Pope and the politicians to regard Communism as our great enemy. So it is, undoubtedly, when it is combined with Russian imperialism that regards itself as having an almost Messianic calling to dominate the world. Moreover, Communism as a name for the godless philosophy of Marxism represents the greatest rival to the Christian religion in the world today. It is natural, too, that those people should regard Communism as the great enemy who, because they have money or education or religion, suppose they themselves would be among the first victims of a Communist regime. But it is a pathetic fallacy to suppose China to be an enemy because China has 'gone Communist,' or to suppose that we can stop the spread of 'Communism' by alliances and air bases in the East. There is at present no more reason why we should regard China as an enemy country than that we should so regard Yugoslavia, and the present American policy towards China throws that great country into the arms of Russia, her only open friend. The way to stem the tide of 'Communism' in Asia and Africa is gladly to accept the dim and perplexed longings of these nascent peoples for a new and better and more honoured life, to show that their friends in these aspirations are the nations of Christendom, and that Christ is the author and the answer of their hopes.

* * *

With much regret I gather that the Colonial Civil Service makes little appeal in these days to those looking for a life-work. It seems popularly to be believed that in another 20 or 30 years there may be no more colonial government, and that in the meanwhile the period of transition offers unattractive prospects. We may reasonably doubt whether in fact the colonial service will end so soon, but in any case we might well regard it as a supreme opportunity for Christian and dedicated men. N. M.

CHRISTIAN DOGMA AND SCIENTIFIC METHOD:

By B. M. G. Reardon, M.A.

The difficulty of commending Christian belief to educated persons to-day is well illustrated by an objection which, if not always formulated in precise terms, is one nevertheless which the apologist repeatedly encounters. That belief, it is argued, takes the form of a *system,* whereas the contemporary mind, guided by the empirical sciences, the authority of which is not to be questioned, is disposed to regard all systems as obsolete. They have given place, that is to say, to *method.* Method explores, investigates, scrutinizes: scientific method the secrets of nature, critical method the documents and traditions of the past, sociological method the mechanism of social groups; and in each instance the results are seen to justify the means. Systems, of their very nature, are *a priori* and more or less arbitrary. Methods, which experience continuously improves, make good their title to respect by an equally continuous enlargement of the area of human knowledge. The exponent of a system proposes at the outset what is to be his goal; the practitioner of a method is content simply to experiment and declines to predict whither his road may lead him. The former is a dogmatist, not seldom arrogant; the latter, with becoming modesty, subjects his views to the tutelage of fact. Theology, therefore, which of all systems is the most pretentious, has nothing in common with the purposes and techniques of science and belongs only to a bygone era.

This contention, very clearly, reintroduces the whole Science *versus* Religion controversy. It is in fact a statement of its essential issue—an issue which, despite complacent assurance to the contrary on the part of theologians and even of some scientists, remains unsettled. We may contribute, however, to the elucidation of the problem by examining its terms and trying to frame a satisfactory definition of them. First, then, what do we mean by 'system'?

The word is derived from the Greek: σύν, with, and ἵστημι, I place or set, and signifies a collection of separate elements so arranged as to form a coherent whole or body. Thus the nerves, as we learn from the physiologists—and as our feelings themselves readily enough inform us—constitute an organic unity which we speak of as the 'nervous system.' What determines a system is the interdependence of its parts. In a complete system there are no loose

ends; everything fits. When therefore the philosopher sets out to create a scheme of *thought*, a metaphysic, he has as his ultimate aim nothing less than the correlation of all forms of human knowledge. The more orderly such a scheme becomes the greater is the economy of effort required for understanding it: as we know from experience, it is easier to learn, as it is to teach, facts which have been neatly systematized. In the mind of the eighteenth century physicists nature itself provided just such a finished order: once the principle of its coherence were grasped the whole could be seen to be implied by—and, ideally, might be constructed from—any one of its parts, much as the palaeontologist can construct the entire skeleton of a hitherto unknown extinct animal from a single fossil bone. The scientists themselves, however, have exploded this hyper-rationalist notion. Nature does not disclose itself to observation as a closed *a priori* system and may not in the name of science be assumed to be so. Science doubtless has had a good deal of success in formulating what we are pleased to describe as 'laws', but the universe accommodates itself to our preconceptions and categories only up to a point; thereafter it may well present us with an unanswerable riddle. If there be a *total* system of nature its architecture is—as yet, at all events—too complex or too indistinct for our full understanding. No wonder that the systematizer is apt to expose himself to the risk of self-deception: he over-simplifies, his selection of facts is too limited, to some of which indeed he may be blind. Nevertheless, systems have their utility. They at least help us to put our experience in order, and such order has demonstrable practical value: witness, notably, the metric and decimal systems—artificial constructs which seem almost to belong to the very fabric of reality.

A 'method', on the other hand, signifies a way (Greek: μέτα, with, ὁδός, road). But a way implies both a traveller and a goal. The goal of course is truth, and the traveller man's reason. Method, therefore, is the means—the most certain and direct available—of progress from ignorance to understanding. It is not easily found, since for the discovery of a given truth one way only will, as a rule, serve; other ways lead only to seeming knowledge, or error. We thus have need to scrutinize our methods, and for the purpose have devised a special discipline: logic, or epistemology, provides a criticism of the necessary means for attaining scientific knowledge as distinct from vague and unverified impressions and opinions. It is in fact the science of sciences. It tells us how the methods appropriate to each vary: that of mathematics, for example, being deductive, that of the empirical sciences experimental. Philosophy also has its methods, based on the intrinsic function of the reason itself. So, too, has theology, the essential constituent of which is

the *data* of revelation. If we are to grasp how the intellect sets about its work of acquiring knowledge a study of this methodology is imperative. In its search for the truth the human mind is endlessly resourceful and energetic; but it often fails in its quest, and when it does so it is usually through misjudgment of the character of the method it is employing.

Thus a system is an assemblage of things arranged in a regular order, each element of which is in a relationship of dependence upon every other; whilst method is a mode of procedure, a way or plan of working. The difference between them is broad enough: there are of course resemblances—both are 'orderly'—but in general they present a contrast. System, we may say, looks to the coherence of the facts under review rather than to the facts themselves, whereas method looks to the facts themselves rather than to their coherence. Each appeals to a different type of mind and provides a different point of view or a different way of judging. The systematizer is concerned primarily with *order*—with the force of logical inference and the symmetry and balance of reasoning. He is an architect, sensitive to the beauty of ideas as they gather themselves into a shapely structure. His interest is in arrangement, exposition, demonstration; and his intelligence finds both stimulus and repose in the harmony of what it contemplates. He is convinced, that is, that the design of his thinking is a transcript of the reality about him. The investigator, however, whose preoccupation is with method, exhibits no particular regard for the pattern into which his ideas may happen to fall. His effort is directed to the matter in hand; his anxiety is only that his means should be the most effective available. If his researches yield no aesthetic satisfaction, or suggest no all-embracing plan of knowledge. he is untroubled. What he looks for is not so much Truth as its more modest components, *facts*.

Both attitudes of mind, the systematic and the methodic, have their merits and their corresponding defects. Each is to be seen at its weakest when it is held to exclude the other. In point of fact, of course, they are complementary. Research must begin with a method, as it appropriately ends with a system, and the most fruitful intelligences have recognized that both are requisite. But as a rule one attitude or the other is found to be determinative: our contemporaries stress the importance—sometimes the sole importance—of correct method, whilst the great thinkers of the past have aimed at system.[1] It is wise to beware of dilemmas but, if we must make a choice between them, it is best that we choose method: conclusions should be tentative and hesitant rather than hasty and

[1]Descartes has his place in the history of thought primarily as the author of the *Discourse on Method*. But his philosophy is eminently systematic. For him the model science is mathematics.

one-sided. The fault of the schematizer fascinated by the mere architectonics of thought is to sacrifice fact to theory.

What, then, of the Christian religion: are we to regard it as a system or as a method? The complaint is frequent, as we began by remarking, that Christianity is essentially, indeed conspicuously, an example of the former. It is (so the objection runs) an *a priori* construction of dogma imposed by authority and impervious to criticism. It has—in the past at all events—been forced upon children before the age when conscious reflection and intelligent decision are at all possible, and maintains itself only by a repetition of traditional practices and formulae. In contrast, science is distinctively a method, controlled, through observation and experiment, by the data of experience. It progresses because it affords us not speculation but assured knowledge. It has discovered much, but of a 'revelation' it knows nothing, and its hypotheses are open to immediate revision in the light of new facts. Science is thus method *par excellence,* and for the modern man what is commonly called the 'scientific attitude' is alone fitting. Religion is but the survival of the pre-scientific outlook and its continuance in the mid-twentieth century an anachronism. It is this assumption, I suspect, which constitutes the greatest single obstacle to evangelism that the Christian churches to-day have to face. It is therefore of the utmost importance to enquire whether its implicit argument is in any respect justifiable. And to this end it will be instructive to apply our definitions.

The first question, however, must be whether science itself is no more than a method; and about the answer there can be no reason for hesitation: it is *both* a method *and* a system. The physical sciences are the result of the application of consistent methods to the investigation of natural phenomena; but they are not a mere collection of facts: they are facts correlated in terms of *law,* and these laws, in turn, are themselves correlated in terms of a general theory. Finally, when a number of theories are shown to imply or presuppose one another we have a system. Thus system derives ultimately from method. We may indeed say that what is popularly meant by science is nothing other than a system—a concept of nature, a theory of the universe. It is, moreover, a system that is evidently capable of a continuous and highly successful practical application: because man can understand nature he also can control it. To the scientist himself, on the other hand, his discipline appears much more certainly to be a method—a method both slow and difficult. Before he can attempt to build he must lay a deep foundation, since even a minimum of synthesis implies, usually, a long previous analysis. A theory can never be more than a fruitful suggestion; certainly not a dogma. One has

only to read the history of science to realize how this is so.[2] If science progresses it is only by way of a constant revision of existing views. Thus the Newtonian physics have in our day given place to the theory of relativity, whilst biology is no longer committed to the transformism of Lamarck and Darwin. In the sciences every new system renders its precursor obsolete; yet each, as the outcome of a proved method, has contributed its share to the advancement of knowledge. To the question whether pursuit of the method *alone* would not have sufficed, the answer is, No: for in the long run the system, provisional though it be, is seen to be itself a part of the total method since, if method creates order, order also suggests method.

Our next question must be whether the description of Christianity as a system only is in fact correct. And the answer here is precisely the same as that to the first question: it is both a system and a method. What I refer to, of course, is Christianity considered not in its theological formulations alone but also, and especially, in its manner of origin and process of development. A 'committed' Christian would hardly think of his religion as a 'system', and probably not as a 'method' either: the terms would seem to him inappropriate. He rather would explain, if questioned, that it is a *life*. But he would as readily acknowledge also that it is a *way* leading to the *truth*. Assuredly, however, it is a thing lived and not merely studied.

Yet it is no less the fact that to the ordinary secularist of today the Christian religion—especially in its main traditional forms, Roman Catholicism, Greek Orthodoxy, orthodox Protestantism—has all the appearance of a body of doctrines or dogmas imposed upon the mind of the believer for his submissive acceptance, thus inhibiting any really free enquiry from the outset.

There is undoubtedly a problem here which the Christian apologist—I would prefer to say the Christian philosopher—must candidly face. His mode of procedure should be that of historical enquiry. He will begin, that is, not with some definition of what he considers Christianity ideally to be, but with the conditions and forms of its historical advent and evolution. How, then, very briefly, are these to be characterized?

Christianity arose out of Judaism and carried with it the Jewish heritage—wherein it contrasted so signally and impressively with

[2] "The progress of science has now reached a turning-point. The stable foundations of physics have broken up: also for the first time physiology is asserting itself as an effective body of knowledge, as distinct from a scrap-heap. The old foundations of scientific thought are becoming unintelligible. Time, space, matter, material, ether, electricity, mechanism, organism, configuration, structure, pattern, function, all require reinterpretation. What is the sense of talking about a mechanical explanation when you do not know what you mean by mechanics?" (A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, ed. 1932, p. 21). These words were written thirty years ago, but serve well enough to give point to my argument.

every variety of ancient paganism—of an undeviating monotheism and a strict ethical code: a religion, moreover, rooted in history and shaped by the vicissitudes of history—always interpreted by the Jews as the medium of Yahweh's self-disclosure. Jesus of Nazareth was himself a historical, not a mythical, figure.[3] Tradition presents Him as a man of the people but also as, at the very least, a prophet and a teacher of truths at once simple and profound—truths of which His life and death were the perfect embodiment and expression, indeed the vindication. This teaching was His own, yet imparted on an authority which He regarded, and which His followers came also to accept, as divine. The surviving first-century accounts of His life and doctrine, to which we give the name of 'gospels', inform us also of His "mighty works", His miracles, and in particular of the circumstances of His death at the hands of the authorities both religious and civic. The narrative ends with an astonishing occurrence: the resurrection of this same Jesus from the dead, on the third day after His burial.

Christ's mission is in some sense, however, to be continued by His disciples, and notably by the chosen twelve, representatives of that minority or *élite* who look for "the consolation of Israel."[4] For this task they have been trained by Him. They are to share His authority to teach men the truth and win them for His "kingdom." They are promised by Him the guidance and help necessary for their work. They thus become conscious of a new life "in Him" and through His "Spirit". Their evangelistic mission is nevertheless refused for the most part by their fellow-countrymen and is now directed towards the pagan world without. Communities of Christian believers—'churches', as they are called—are founded here and there throughout the Graeco-Roman world, even in Rome itself. These churches are the local embodiments of the one Church which, as the society of the redeemed in Christ and open to all mankind regardless of sex, race, nationality or social status, constitutes the "new Israel." In the course of only a very few centuries the Roman *imperium* itself accepts this teaching and way of life, so that civilization as such may be said to have become Christian. This Christian order reaches its apogee in the Middle Ages, and although the Church as a visible institution is rent by schism and its witness correspondingly impaired, it yet shines through history as the reflection of that Light "which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

Such, in a few words, is the account of the origin and growth

[3]This is not to imply necessary dissent from Dr. Bultmann's view "that the New Testament presents the event of Jesus Christ in mythical terms" (*Kerygma and Myth*, Eng. trans. by R. H. Fuller, p. 34). But 'Christ-myth' theories of the type propounded by Drews have failed to gain any serious support even among critics who would not allow a 'supernatural' interpretation of the rise of Christianity.

[4]Lk. ii, 25.

of his religion which any Christian might be prepared to give. It is an appeal not to dogma but to what are claimed to be facts: a sequence of historical events comprising the call and preparation of the Jews, the advent of the Messiah, His life, death and resurrection, and the supernatural energizing of the community which He founded. The existence of the Church bears witness to this *Heilsgeschichte,* which does not belong only to some timeless 'other' world of myth but, on the contrary, is subject—for all its transcendental meaning—to those terrestrial conditions of time and space by which every historical event is bounded. Its transcendental meaning? By this phrase we indicate the place of dogma in Christianity. Dogma is essentially the *interpretation* of fact, for religion begins not with categories of belief—with theology—but with experience. The facts are the data of what the Christian faith regards as Revelation: the dogmas may be said to be revealed only because they are deduced—imperfectly deduced, it may well be—from the facts. Thus it is that the Christian must always attach importance to history; not, certainly, to the entire exclusion of metaphysics: metaphysics has its role, as we shall see in a moment; but there can be no metaphysical Christianity which is not first historical.[5]

But a religion which rests upon what are alleged to be authentic occurrences in time must, if it is to render account of itself on rational grounds, be ready to expose its characteristic beliefs to the kind of enquiry which normally falls within the province of the historian. The Christian theologian has therefore to recognize the function of the historical method in its bearing upon his own particular work of explanation and synthesis. He must endeavour to verify the data. The life and mission of Jesus and the witness thereto of the apostles are matters with which the historian *qua* historian may quite legitimately concern himself, seeking to test the reliability of the records of first-century Christianity in exactly the same way as he will that of any other records of persons or events in the past. His mode of procedure has its principles and its tried techniques, and he will be as assiduous and exacting in his investigations as the historical importance of the subject requires. Hence it is that faith cannot dispense with historical enquiry concerning its factual basis. It is a question here of subjecting system to method. But the historical is not the only method of verification to prove necessary. There is another no less vital, namely, the philosophical.

The historical enquiry would doubtless suffice if the Biblical

[5]The German-speaking theologian can usefully distinguish between *geschichtlich* and *historisch*. But Christianity is not truly *geschichtlich* unless it is also, as regards certain of its basic data, genuinely *historisch*.

records were of interest only as witnesses to past *fact*. Their significance however is by no means purely historical: much more is it a matter of interpreting their content in terms of something which transcends history, so that their essential meaning is not exhausted by reference merely to the 'natural' order of events, but demands the postulate of a 'supernatural' activity of a specific kind. Obviously such considerations cannot be weighed by the historian and must lift the whole enquiry outside his field of study. We now are in the realm of faith: but what belongs to faith is of concern also to the philosopher. The Biblical history, so the Christian claims, is instinct with theological valuation. It is 'divine' history as well as human, fraught with instances of the special activity of God, and imbued throughout with the notion of divine providence and purposiveness; to the extent indeed of being non-significant apart from such ideas. That a man should not only rise from the dead, and even 'ascend into heaven,' but should himself be, in some strange fashion, God, is a belief the veracity of which the historian has no means whatsoever of testing. But its presuppositions are those precisely with which, as a rule, the metaphysician has been very much concerned—presuppositions which cry out for scrutiny according to the methods of philosophy. Belief in the Incarnation presupposes belief in the existence of God: without conviction of the latter the former is meaningless. Similarly belief in the possibility of miracle is incompatible with the conception of the order of nature as a closed system of immutable law. Belief in the resurrection, again, implies recognition that the life of the soul is not bounded by the conditions of earthly existence alone. Were these beliefs capable of *disproof* by reason, the Gospel record, no matter how well attested from the standpoint of the critical historian, would have simply to be dismissed as a fiction—pious, no doubt, and perhaps genuinely edifying—but a fiction none the less, to be attributed to some kind of collective delusion on the part of the Apostolic witnesses. And in truth, without rational assurance as to the validity of the presuppositions, or at least a measure of confidence that those presuppositions are capable of rational justification, admiration for the central figure of the Gospels could not attain to that degree of heart-felt conviction which the Christian speaks of as 'saving faith.'

The method of historical verification must thus be supplemented by that of philosophical verification. Reason must seek to show that belief in the existence of God, in the possibility of miracle and in the immortality of the soul is itself a reasonable thing. It thus forms a main part of that prolegomenon to theology which we call the philosophy of religion and the importance of which in any

scheme of Christian study should on no account be minimized.[6] To trace the lines of such an undertaking lies outside the scope of our purpose here, but an indication of its direction may be given. Philosophical enquiry is likely, I suggest, to begin with man's self-consciousness, his awareness of aspirations and desires within himself to which finite ends offer no lasting satisfaction. Why this should be so, whither the impulse tends and whence is its origin, are natural questions for his searching intelligence. Does finitude, he is bound sooner or later to ask himself, imply infinity? And is it in the nature of the finite to be for ever drawn—possibly even in spite of itself—towards the infinite?

This is a problem, be it noted, not for the specialist thinker, the philosopher, alone. Though the philosopher only will pursue it with all the rigour of a trained understanding it is, nevertheless, also a problem for everyman; a problem, simply, of cause and effect, such as falls within the experience of us all. If we fail to heed it, it will be through inattention or preoccupation.

Thus it is that the claims of Christianity, if they are to be sustained on rational grounds, will depend upon a twofold proof: that God, transcendent and providential, exists, and that the Christian tradition regarding Jesus Christ is substantially authentic. If both questions can be answered affirmatively the conclusion may be drawn which finds expression in the Creed, viz., that Christ was indeed divine—God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God. The first question is a metaphysical one, the second a historical. The conclusion expresses that idea of the union of the historical and the supra-historical which is peculiarly Christian. Acceptance of Christianity implies, therefore, the application of a rational method: not, of course, by each individual believer—motives or reasons for believing are not the same as grounds of belief. But clearly the profession of Christianity is not merely a matter of sentiment: the impulse to believe, even when not prompted or reinforced by rational motives, is capable of justification on rational grounds. And the methods which the philosopher or the savant employs are the same as those made use of in any other field of investigation or in the ordinary practical affairs of life.

It must, however, be recognized that 'proof' in matters of religious faith has not, and cannot have, the force of mathematical demonstration. It illuminates the understanding, but does not compel acceptance; a margin of doubt always remains in which the wilful sceptic can entrench himself. Further, whoever embraces

[6]The recent emphasis upon 'Biblical theology' has already, I fear, had this regrettable result. It is too commonly represented that so long only as we know what the Biblical authors themselves believed little further thought is necessary as to what it may or may not be possible for us to believe. Bultmann's 'De-mythologizing', whatever criticisms we may wish to make of it, has at least served to remind us that Biblical ideas require some degree of re-formulation in modern terms.

Christianity *ex animo* commits himself *wholly*: his action is not only an intellectual assent but a submission of heart and will. It is hence not difficult to perceive why resistance to the Christian faith on intellectual grounds receives powerful support from unavowed and non-rational motives. To believe as a Christian believes means not only an adherence of the intellect but a purification of the moral personality. And the light of truth is not always welcome.

'Method,' then, we would say, has its proper place in the rational interpretation of Christianity. But no less true is it that Christian thought constitutes a 'system.' The basic facts imply certain doctrines which have been enshrined in the Creed. But the Creed is no more than a terse and formal summary and cannot be said to comprise what the truly converted and fully instructed Christian understands by *belief*. Dogmas are not received by the enquiring mind as so many isolated units; they need to be seen in relation one to another: how one implies others, how indeed together they establish an integral whole. The work of theology is to present these diverse elements of faith in terms of a finished synthesis and as a unified system of truth. It seeks to show the interaction and the mutual dependence of the visible and the invisible, the temporal and the eternal, examining the data of revelation in the light of the speculative reason. Its aim is to show that faith and reason, whatever tensions or oppositions may exist between them, have ultimately the same object—infinite Being. In other words, a theological system aspires to be, within the limits of revelation, a clear and perspicuous reflection of the divine Reality itself.

How far does it achieve this? The answer has to be, Not wholly so. The synthesis of faith and reason is never complete. The forms of belief require repeated adjustment to our growing knowledge of life and the world. The synthesis has indeed found expression historically in a succession of varying systems each of which takes its character not only from the age and the circumstances of its formulation but from the impress also of the personality that has done most to fashion it. Hence it is that distinctive theologies are associated with the names of Origen and Augustine, Aquinas and Bonaventura, Luther and Calvin. Each such body of doctrines possesses a wholeness or unity, deriving from an individual temperament and outlook or from a specific type of Christian experience. Each has its own principle of coherence, its characteristic spiritual vitality. A great theological system is, we may say, a manifestation of the creative impulse and its author an artist in ideas.

Thus it is that theological systems differ from scientific. Scientific systems in time supersede one another and those that become obsolete retain no more than an historical interest. But we cannot really say that St. Thomas 'superseded' St. Augustine, and it

certainly is highly debatable whether Luther and Calvin superseded the Scholastics. There are, of course, some elements in every theological synthesis which are more perishable than others: elements, for example, that depend upon the limited secular knowledge and understanding of the day. But the system as a whole may continue as a possible interpretation of the Christian gospel in rational terms capable of ministering to the spiritual and intellectual needs of new generations. Such systems do not necessarily contradict one another, but they offer different angles, so to speak, of spiritual vision. Those may be accounted the most satisfactory and perdurable which convey the most comprehensive and well ordered impression of the essential features of Christian experience.

Between theology and science there is, however, one obvious parallel. Both may be said to begin with a method and to work through to a system. If the task of construction exemplifies the principle of *fides quaerens intellectum*, the application of a method exemplifies that of *intellectus quaerens fidem*. We have therefore to conclude that religious thought involves both system and method: the latter being at once philosophical and historical, responding to the questions whether God exists, and, if so, how He has revealed himself; the former, on the other hand, being theological, offering, so far as the mystery of faith allows, an intellectual *schema* of the facts of that revelation and their mutual bearing and dependence. Method and system are complementary, and to oppose them is to raise a false antithesis. If their mutual implication appears at all obscure it is simply because in any given epoch it is likely that one or other will be receiving more emphasis than its counterpart. The mediaeval period was *par excellence* the age of theological systems: faith sought understanding. To-day, it would seem, the reverse is true: understanding seeks faith. It is apparent, furthermore, that system does not rightly precede method. We may not take it as axiomatic that things necessarily conform to our assumptions and pre-formed categories of thinking. This, as we have remarked, was the conspicuous fault of the eighteenth century rationalists who endeavoured to substitute an *a priori* schematization of nature for the more humdrum task of observing it. It was the fault, too, of Hegel and the Hegelians, for whom 'mere' fact had always to be held subordinate to the demands of the grand architectural design. But a system must be constructed upon and conditioned by precisely such 'mere' facts given to us in experience. When the data have been established—discovered and verified by use of the appropriate methodology—the system itself becomes a necessary instrument of the understanding and is not to be dispensed with. Science no less than theology strives towards

a comprehensive interpretation of the entire field of its study. In both, man attempts a 'God's eye' view of reality, and in both, accordingly, does he court the spiritual danger of imagining that he himself is omniscience.

How, then, is the Christian to regard the modern 'secular' mind, of which the so-called 'scientific outlook' is the characteristic expression? The word 'secular' or 'secularist' has become a synonym for 'agnostic', or even 'atheist.' Thus a Christian could scarcely describe his own outlook as 'secular', however much alive he may be to the concerns and claims of the phenomenal world. Rather is it commonly supposed by such as might openly profess the secularist point of view that the Christian is not free to think for himself and that his intelligence is simply at the behest of authority and tradition. Yet he in turn will rightly ask whether the scientific outlook is itself as 'free' as its popular exponents imagine. Is it not also 'systematic', even in the pejorative sense of the word which we have been examining? Certainly it often appears to assume without argument that the case for religion cannot be argued and has no basis. For it 'Science' has become a new authority whose decrees are unquestionable. On the other hand, the Christian philosopher has confidence in the freedom of thought, but he realizes that when the truth of any matter is attained then to that extent thought accepts limitation. The mind must always submit to the facts. A wholly uncommitted attitude is a contradiction in terms; for whatever attitude one adopts towards reality will involve certain implicit views about its nature. It is not surprising, therefore, that agnosticism usually represents a negative, rather than a merely suspended, judgment. The acknowledged sceptic can seldom mask the fact that he has already made up his mind.

Christianity poses an immense and difficult intellectual problem, the solution of which is not possible without prolonged reflection and study. It appeals to tradition, to the authority of the past, because the spiritual insights of many generations constitute a datum of which it must take the fullest account. But the Christian thinker has before him a perennial task in examining the meaning and implications of Christian faith and experience. He is ever searching, testing, verifying. But the refusal of belief calls no less for rational justification; for what is there in the nature of things which should make it more reasonable to deny than to affirm? Certainly, the Christian does not demand any renunciation of the rational understanding, and whatever concessions must in practice be made to the needs and infirmities of the simple and unschooled, he recognizes the essential truth of the words of Augustine: *Turpe est sine ratione cuiquam credere.*

BAPTIST-CONGREGATIONALIST RELATIONSHIPS[1]

By Ernest A. Payne, M.A., D.D.

The relationship between Baptists and Congregationalists in this and other countries is a matter of great importance and considerable interest. It has never, so far as I know, been closely studied or fully set out. All I can do in this short paper is to set down a few facts about the relationship which has existed in this country; to note certain new features characteristic of recent decades; and to offer a few comments.

I

The history of Baptists and Congregationalists is, I believe, one and indivisible. They are part of the same movement in Christian history. The inspiration and roots of their church-life are the same. Their basic interpretation of the gospel and of church order is the same. The type of Christian character which they have nurtured is essentially the same. By and large, in doctrine, worship and polity they are so closely similar that to a stranger they are at first indistinguishable unless he happens to be present when the rite of baptism is being administered or discoursed upon. Only by ignoring the facts of history, or by special pleading, can the two denominations be regarded as entirely separate Christian traditions.

I am well aware that there are today some in both bodies who would dissent from this view. There are many in the Southern Baptist Convention of the United States who divide Christians into the categories: Orthodox, Roman, Protestant and Baptist. Even more surprisingly, there are now some Congregationalists anxious so to rewrite their history as to prove themselves a race apart from most of those who have borne the name in the last three hundred years.

In this connection a few words may be relevant about the views recently put forward regarding Congregational origins by Dr. Douglas Horton and certain other American Congregationalists. We are asked to believe that Congregationalism is to be sharply distinguished from Separatism and that those who have traced its origins back to the days of Elizabeth are wrong. My own belief is that both Baptists and Congregationalists must seek their modern beginnings in the sixteenth century and in the left wing of the

[1]A paper read to the Theological Commission of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

Reformation movement, and that the close similarities between them are, and have always been, due to that fact.

Dr. Douglas Horton has said of an essay by Mr. Verne D. Morey, published in the bulletin of the American Congregational Association for January, 1954, that it might well be entitled "Goodbye Mr. Browne" because it " definitively and finally bows Robert Browne out of Congregationalism." The case rests on the suggestion that Henry Jacob (1563-1624), who established a congregational church in Southwark in 1616, when he was with John Robinson in Leyden five years earlier, was not then converted to the need for separation from the Church of England—as has usually been assumed—but, on the contrary, succeeded in converting Robinson to a more sympathetic judgment of the Church of England; and, further, that, if this is true, it constitutes a sufficient reason for making 1616 the birth-date of a Christian tradition distinct from all that had gone before. On this view, the "fathers of Congregationalism" are, besides Henry Jacob, Robert Parker (1564-1614), Paul Baynes (d. 1617), William Bradshaw (1571-1618) and *primus inter pares*, William Ames (1576-1633). Morey then traces the true succession *via* Thomas Hooker (1586-1647), Hugh Peter (1598-1660), John Cotton (1584-1652), John Davenport (1597-1660), Richard Mather (d. 1669), John Forbes, John Lathrop and Henry Jessey (1601-1663), to the five Independents who were members of the Westminster Assembly. This is a curiously mixed list and it is interesting to note, in passing, that it includes Jessey, who became a Baptist in 1645, and—unless my identification of him is at fault—the John Forbes, who was a Scottish defender of episcopacy.

Many years ago, Dr. J. H. Shakespeare drew attention to the fact that John Robinson's Congregationalism included some "surprising elements."[2] There were, of course, in the eighty years between 1580 and 1660, much divergence and argument among the radicals as to how far 'separation' should go. But the following points are to be noted:

(1) Robert Browne has been aptly described by Professor Carlson, who has given us a definitive text of his works, as "an Erastian Congregationalist", which might be expected to commend him to Dr. Horton. In his letter to Mr. Flower, written in 1588-89, Browne expressly denied that he had ever said that the Church of England was no church.[3] Since this is a point to which Dr. Horton attaches considerable importance why part with Browne? His chief weakness from the standpoint of traditional Congregationalism is that he was not a resolute enough Separatist.

[2] *Baptist and Congregationalist Pioneers*, p. 161.
[3] *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, p. 525.

(2) Parting with Browne involves parting with Greenwood, Barrow and Penry—more easily done, perhaps, in the United States than here. But it involves parting with R. W. Dale, whose interpretation of Congregationalism rested largely on their writings, with P. T. Forsyth and, among the moderns, with Daniel Jenkins.

(3) John Robinson, though he refused to repudiate his baptism at the hands of the Church of England and allowed private fellowship with godly members of that Church, expressly refused public communion in acts of worship in his *Manumissions* (1615), a reply to the specific plea of William Ames in his *Manudiction* (1614). It is, therefore, probably necessary, if we follow Horton and Morey, to bow John Robinson out of Congregationalism as well.

(4) Henry Jacob in his *Divine Beginning* (1610), though he clearly stated his view that there were in the Church of England "true churches," said equally clearly that they were such "accidentally." Does such a statement really justify us in removing him from the Separatist tradition and making him into an ecumenical pioneer, one of the founders of 'International Congregationalism'?[4]

(5) The famous Southwark Church, which Jacob founded, was, at least from 1630 onwards, engaged in frequent discussions as to the validity of Church of England baptism—and that quite apart from the question as to the right subject of baptism. It is further to be noted as more germane to our main subject that of the six churches that sprang from the Southwark Church no less than five became Baptist.

(6) The Baptist churches of the period were not all of one mind on terms of communion, or on the true unit of churchmanship, or on the permissible relationship to a parochial system and a national church. It would be quite impossible to separate their history from that of Brownism, or from that of Horton's specialized form of Congregationalism. Indeed, it is not clear that Horton wishes to do so. But the existence and history of these Baptist Churches constitutes a further serious objection to his case.

II

Whatever the motive, this American attempt to rewrite Congregational history is, I believe, misguided and erroneous. Congregationalist and Baptist origins alike run back into Separatism.

In the seventeenth century there arose two groups of churches, both congregational in principle, the one practising the baptism of infants, the other believers' baptism. Because of the basic congregational principle, each fellowship was entitled to decide its own

[4]Morey. *op. cit.*, p. 13.

terms of communion, but the two bodies were close enough together for there to be a number of 'mixed communion' churches, that is, churches recognizing both forms of baptism. "Differences of judgment about water baptism no bar to communion," said Bunyan, whom both denominations have continued to claim as one of their shining lights. In several parts of the country, churches of this type continued on into the eighteenth century. A detailed study of the histories of these individual fellowships would be well worthwhile. The mother church of Welsh Nonconformity at Llanvaches is a case in point. That in Northampton is another. The church at New Road, Oxford, is a third; Congregationalism as a separate body did not begin in Oxford until the 1830's and then by the dismission of a group from New Road.

It is, of course, true that certain so-called Independents had accepted the Cromwellian attempts at a religious settlement more easily and wholeheartedly than did most Baptists. It is true that after 1662 the ejected Independents felt a close kinship with the ejected Presbyterians. It is true that in the Heads of Agreement an attempt was made to link together the churches gathered by certain of the ejected ministers, but this attempt failed, partly because of a fundamental difference in polity and partly because of the strange lapse of so many of the Presbyterians into Arianism and Socinianism. The churches that really carried on our main tradition in the depressing early decades of the eighteenth century, whether Congregational or Baptist, were the churches that were most alike in doctrine and polity, and in many places the churches that were really joint fellowships.

With the coming of the Evangelical Revival and the Industrial Revolution, both communities spread rapidly and churches multiplied. There was no joint action or common planning. There was room for all. New fellowships were founded and they practised either paedobaptism or believers' baptism. The missionary movement helped to link the churches together. Carey and his friends formed a Baptist society. The London Missionary Society tried to cast its net wider than one denomination or type of churchmanship, but fairly quickly became a mainly Congregationalist agency. Soon Baptists and Congregationalists formed each their own Union for home purposes. But in the nineteenth century, the rapid growth of population made the task so vast that few of the leaders seem to have thought of these Unions as rival organizations. The Baptist Handbooks of the mid-nineteenth century contained a full list of the Independent ministers in and around London and other details about Congregationalists. Many of the Baptist Churches, which had at one time or at first had a membership closed to all but those who had been baptized as believers, opened their membership so

that paedobaptists could be admitted. Co-operation between the colleges established for ministerial training began early in the nineteenth century and increased as the century advanced. The two Unions campaigned together for full civil rights. In 1886, the year Mansfield College was established, they held a joint Assembly in the City Temple.

The addresses delivered at this joint Assembly are of considerable interest. Charles Williams, a Baptist, began by making clear that they unchurched nobody. "If," he said, " 'a congregation of faithful men,' 'the members of Christ,' meeting in any one place 'in His name' be a church of God, Presbyterians and Methodists can claim that their denominations are made up of such churches. For myself, I rejoice to believe that Episcopalians, who gather together in obedience to Christ, that they may hold fellowship with Him and keep His commandment, are no less and no more a church than the believers who congregate in this City Temple or in a village Baptist chapel." Both Dr. Conder and Dr. Clifford noted and rejoiced at the spread of Congregational principles and practice in other bodies. Dr. Clifford went so far as to say with refreshing candour: "There is nearly as much self-management at St. Stephen's Episcopalian Church, at Denbigh Road Wesleyan Church, at St. George's Presbyterian Church, as there is at Craven Hill Independent or Westbourne Park Baptist." Dr. Henry Allon said that he put Church organization simply and explicitly on the grounds of expediency and declared: "I do not know that my conscience would be greatly violated if in special circumstances I thought it expedient to administer a Presbyterian form of church government or a Catholic form of church government." Guinness Rogers stated: "If I had my lot cast in a small place where the Baptists had a flourishing church, I would go and join the Baptist church if they would have me, and would not start a rival Congregational Church in the place." Some of these utterances were perhaps due to the exhilaration of the occasion, but they may serve to dispel some illusions about the Victorians and their attitude to Christian unity. The close of the nineteenth century saw the formation of the National Free Church Council and it is to be remembered that its founders—men like Charles Berry, Hugh Price Hughes and John Clifford—had specifically in mind the creation of a United Free Church and believed it to be not far distant.

The Baptist Union and the Congregational Union met in joint session on at least one other occasion, in 1901. The movement for closer collaboration seemed to be gaining momentum. The early years of the twentieth century were notable for the establishment of a number of 'union' churches, sponsored jointly by Baptists and Congregationalists and affiliated to both Unions. Recently the

Baptist Union Council set up a special committee which collected data about churches of this kind. A brief summary of what was discovered may be of interest for the facts are not generally known. There are thirty churches which appear in both the Baptist and Congregational Handbooks because they are apparently affiliated to, certainly recognized by, both Unions. Another twenty-six churches, plus a group in Huntingdonshire, appear only in the Baptist Handbook, but are described as Union churches. Twelve churches, described as Union churches, appear only in the Congregational Handbook. Of these sixty-eight churches a number in Bedfordshire and the neighbouring counties date back to the tradition of 'mixed communion' associated with the name of Bunyan, many being in membership with the Bedfordshire Union of Baptist and Congregational Churches, a unique association which fits oddly and with difficulty into the modern denominational organizations. A few of the sixty-eight churches have an agreement, sometimes recorded in the Trust Deed, that the ministry alternate between the two denominations, but of recent years these agreements have not always been rigidly adhered to. In certain cases, e.g. Fairford, difficult legal and practical issues have emerged and it has seemed best to recommend that the churches affiliate with only one Union. Of the thirty churches in membership with both Unions, a number are now in practice related closely to only one of the denominations and have become in effect denominational churches with open membership and open communion. Local conditions and individual leadership have determined the direction the churches have taken. It seems doubtful whether either denomination can claim any marked advantage over the other in this process.

The Baptist Union committee came to the conclusion that at the present time only four churches can be regarded as Union Churches in the sense in which the term is usually understood, that is, as implying full 'plural belonging,' *viz.* Letchworth (1905), Amersham-on-the-Hill (1908), Hampstead Garden Suburb (1910) and Hutton and Shenfield (1913). But to these there should probably be added some others, e.g. Colwyn Bay (1890), Loughton (1817), an old church, which in the nineteenth century adopted new Trust Deeds which made it Baptist, but which has strong Congregationalist interests; and certain churches in the suburbs of Leicester, formed on wide trusts, but linked most closely with the Baptist Union. It is to be noted that Amersham-on-the-Hill, Hutton and Shenfield, Letchworth and Hampstead Garden Suburb were formed within a decade of one another in new townships or estates of a special kind. They were all launched with strong financial backing. In perhaps half of the sixty-eight churches mentioned above—probably not more—both believers' Baptism

and paedobaptism are regularly administered, though if the minister is a Baptist, he secures a Congregational minister to administer infant baptism, and vice-versa.

These facts suggest a rather confused and unsatisfactory situation.

III

The National Free Church Council was formed by men who thought that a United Free Church of England would soon be a reality. The Union Churches which were established in the opening years of the present century were most of them the product of the same hope and intention. Forty years on, this hope seems much more unsubstantial. It has probably to be admitted that Baptists and Congregationalists are not at the denominational level as close together as they were at the close of the nineteenth century. What are the reasons for this? A number of different influences have been at work.

(1) The two denominations have drawn somewhat apart theologically. Baptists have never been as homogeneous a body as Congregationalists. All through their history there have been theological and practical tensions, but the unity and fellowship achieved in the nineteenth century have come to be much treasured. Baptists faced a dangerous crisis at the time of the Down Grade Controversy in the late 1880s. Spurgeon, their most famous preacher, stood resolutely against newer trends in theology and critical views of the Bible. But when he withdrew from the Union he was not followed by many of his friends, even those conservative in their views. Slowly but surely the breaches caused by the Down Grade Controversy have been healed and the denomination remains a very mixed fellowship, with a considerable number in it still sympathetic to the views of the Bible for which Spurgeon stood. The Congregationalists, on the other hand, not only came more easily to terms with Higher Criticism, but early in the twentieth century produced a New Theology movement of an extremely liberal type. They have shown themselves more erratic theologically, for they have now produced a school of neo-orthodoxy, deeply influenced by Barth, Brunner and Niebuhr, whose names are far less often heard in Baptist circles. These changes of *ethos* have caused the two denominations to move somewhat farther apart than they were in the nineteenth century and have even caused them to look a little suspiciously at one another.

(2) We have to note the effect of the growing strength of the two Unions, the increased complexity of their organization, their vested interests, the struggle for funds adequate to meet the changing value of money since the first World War and the declining numerical strength of the Free Churches. All this constitutes a rather sad

story. Neither Union now finds it easy to surrender any centre from which it may gather support. Both Unions have devised elaborate schemes for keeping alive churches which are not able to be self-supporting. The situation is entirely different from that of the nineteenth century when both denominations were expanding. One of the serious, but largely unrealized developments of our time is that the Free Churches, which broke with traditional and institutionalized religion in its medieval, Roman and Anglican forms, have, during the past two or three generations, rapidly created highly complex business organizations with substantial properties and trust funds of their own.

(3) The linking together in the National Free Church Council and the present Free Church Federal Council, of the Methodists and Presbyterians, as well as the Congregationalists and Baptists, has set the relationships of the two latter bodies in a wider context. The leaders of 1886 at their joint Assembly seem to have thought of the two denominations as almost one group. Regular joint meetings were envisaged without difficulty. An even closer fusion was contemplated by many. Twenty-five years later, however, J. H. Shakespeare had begun his campaign for a more comprehensive Free Church Union. "What the shape of modern England would have become if it had been allowed to develop according to the logic of the pre-1914 situation is," as Daniel Jenkins has said, "an interesting but vain speculation."[5] The Education Controversy of the early years of the century deflected the Free Church Council movement from its original path, but Shakespeare believed that he had set things on the right course again when he promoted the Federal Council. But within a few years the Methodists made it clear that they were seriously interested only in the union of the various groups of Methodists—at any rate for the time being. Somewhat tentative and hesitant discussions, which created little enthusiasm, were embarked upon by Baptists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians with a view to closer union, but the Congregationalists of the twentieth century soon came to feel that there was more hope of a concordat with the Presbyterians than with the Baptists. I have sometimes felt that the difficulties of a closer alliance between Baptists and Congregationalists are increased by the fact that they belong so obviously to the same family; one might almost say that their marriage appears barred by the table of kinship. But, whatever the reason, none of the attempts to devise unions at the denominational level has had any really effective or influential consequences.

(4) Yet another feature of the present situation comes from the increased denominational consciousness, which has found

[5] *Congregationalism: A Restatement*, p. 124.

expression in and is fostered by World Confessional Alliances. The International Congregational Council was established in 1891. Shortly before his death, Dr. Albert Peel stated that, when the proposal was first made, it was suggested that Baptists should be included. I know nothing of the details of this, nor whether it was a really serious proposal. Had it been adopted, recent history might have been very different. Baptists formed their own World Alliance in 1905 and soon discovered, somewhat to their surprise, what a numerous community they are—now well over 20,000,000 church members. International Congregationalism, when it redefined its basis in 1948, made no reference to paedobaptism, and, conscious perhaps of the importance of making as imposing a showing as possible in the ecumenical field, has recently been seeking fellowship with the Covenant Church of Sweden, the Remonstrants of Holland and even the Frei Evangelische Gemeinde, the last named a body in which baptism is usually administered only on profession of faith. Much of the denominational interest and effort of the past few decades have gone—in both Baptist and Congregational circles—to the fostering of these world denominational relationships. This has proved easier and less frustrating than the finding of new relationships nearer home.

(5) But with the growth of the Ecumenical Movement the scene has become even more complex. Both in this country, and in the wider world, church relationships as a whole have changed. Since the first World War the Free Churches of this country and the Church of England have ceased to stand in battle array over against one another. The Lambeth Appeal of 1920 appeared to register so profound a change in the attitude of the Anglican bishops that J. H. Shakespeare and a number of Free Church leaders believed that a United Church of England was only just round the corner. Three series of official conversations have proved disillusioning and have made clear the continuing obstacles in the way of any new religious settlement in this country. The conversations have bred a considerable measure of cynicism in certain quarters; I myself think an excessive measure, for the talks have greatly helped the process of mutual education and respectful friendship. But they have occupied a great deal of time and energy and they have diverted attention from the narrower field of Baptist-Congregationalist relations. Baptists and Congregationalists are now side by side in the British Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches. These exciting new relationships have played their part also in preventing the search for greater intimacy with old friends.

(6) There is a further matter to be noted. During recent decades negotiations for Church Unions have taken place in many different

parts of the world. In a number of cases they have resulted in Congregationalists joining with those of other traditions—in Canada, for instance, in the United States, and in South Africa. In none of these unions have Baptists participated. Since the formation of the Baptist World Alliance, it is the stricter wing of the Baptist movement which has, on the whole, been dominant, the wing, that is, which hesitates about full church fellowship with those who practise infant baptism. In Ceylon and North India, however, where church union negotiations are now proceeding, the local Baptist communities have been involved and the schemes now before the churches include attempts to recognize both forms of baptism. Whether the present negotiations will prove acceptable, either to Baptists or to their fellow-negotiators, no one can say. Such progress as has been made has been aided by the current discussion of baptism in all the main Christian traditions.

Most Baptists feel deeply hesitant about admitting that the baptism of infants is really Christian baptism and are anxious to establish the right of the individual, who may have been 'baptized' in infancy, to confess his faith by immersion later on, if led thereto by conscientious conviction. In the North India negotiations, an Anglican has recently proposed a form of words which might, in his view, meet the difficulty. The suggested formula for profession of faith with immersion, is as follows:

> N. or M. was baptized at.....on.....in water in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. He desires to affirm his Baptism and confess his faith. In token that he has died with Christ, been buried with Him and is risen with Him, he is now immersed in water, thereby bearing witness to his regeneration in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

This is ingenious. Whether it prove acceptable or not, it is evidence of the deep desire that Baptists find a place in the unions that are being sought.

IV

Baptists often appear a very difficult and intransigent community. Though their practice in regard to baptism has kept close to that of the New Testament and the early Church, their interpretation of the rite has often been very inadequate, particularly of recent generations. On the other hand, they cannot but be confirmed in their general attitude by the increasing number of Christians who, under the inspiration of the New Testament, practise believers' baptism and by the concern now being felt in the Lutheran, Reformed and Anglican churches about the difficulties, both theological and practical, which have revealed themselves through the practice of infant baptism.

Where, then, should we go from here? In particular, what should we do as we face the situation in this country? Is there any chance of Baptists and Congregationalists renewing the close fellowship which existed half a century ago and at earlier periods in their history? I see no immediate prospect of a United Church of England nor of a United Free Church, though I believe that 'conversations' should continue and that closer fellowship could be achieved at all levels. The evangelistic task before us is so great, however, the difficulties in the way of providing churches in new townships and housing estates so formidable, and our resources so limited, that Baptists and Congregationalists surely should and could consider some kind of combined strategy. The Baptist Union Committee already referred to came to the following conclusions:

(1) It is generally preferable that on a new estate or in a new town a denominational church should be formed but with open membership.
(2) In certain areas, where local conditions warrant it and point definitely in that direction, the possibility of a Union Church (i.e. a church associated with more than one denomination) should not be excluded. In such a case, however, contributions to the building fund should come from each of the denominations concerned. The contributions of the church to the Unions should be in equal proportions and, should ministerial grants be necessary, they should be on the same basis.

The second of these recommendations failed to secure acceptance in the Baptist Union Council, where the tide runs at present fairly strongly in a more exclusive direction. On the other hand, the Council refused to adopt the first recommendation by itself or to adopt any resolution which might appear to question the rights or status of existing Union churches. The Council preferred to leave the whole matter without any declaration about it. It was perhaps unfortunate that a local Congregational Union and a local Baptist Association had pressed for some kind of decision at the highest level on general policy. The time is not opportune for that. But the measure of success which has attended the Union churches formed forty years ago makes one hope that some others will yet appear. The pioneering must be done locally, it would seem, but that is surely the way most in accord with the genius and tradition of both communities. And it is to be noted that the Rev. F. G. Healey, the secretary of the Presbyterian Church of England, who has recently pleaded for a United Reformed Church embracing all the Free Churches of this land, believes that the most fruitful practical step at the present time is by way of local adventuring and experiment.

HANGING THE TRUMPET IN THE HALL

By Christopher Driver

We sometimes sing the Paraphrase[1] which contains the verse:

No longer hosts encountering hosts
Their millions slain deplore;
They hang the trumpet in the hall
And study war no more.

We sing it more often than we attend to its subject matter, for it treats of a problem which we consistently avoid discussing. It is not only that the word 'pacifist' marks down as intellectually negligible the man to whom it is applied, nor even that the Church, already split lengthwise into denominations, would like to ignore the awkward cross-grained cut inflicted on it by disagreement on this issue. It is rather that the subject is one on which we have already made up our minds, whether by decision or default. For many young people, army service has compromised both their power to change, and their will to discuss, their decision. Again, we are all of us a little unwilling to let our intellects play too freely in public on a subject about which we cannot afford to be wrong. So it comes to pass that on this most vital point of Christian controversy and human anxiety we form a skin over our opinions, and shrink from the problem alike in our sermons and in our Church Meetings.

This article is offered as an attempt to anchor theological discussion to political realities. For this problem has become more than ever one of Christian expediency. It is not practicable to discuss war, at whatever level, without the discussion being also political, and politics has been defined as "the art of the possible." 'Christian expediency' will doubtless involve us in Christian ethics and Christian eschatology. But even the counting of consequences can be a moral proceeding, and not merely the tactical outcome of a precedent and independent moral decision. So let us consider our problem in terms of two of the spikiest dilemmas with which we are at present faced, Mau Mau and the Hydrogen Bomb. Thus we may see that on this question the Christian must be realistic to the point of scepticism.

Mr. John Ferguson recently told the Oxford University Congregational Society that he had been trying for a long time to get the pacifist movement to face up to Mau Mau. The situation is

[1] 'Behold the mountain of the Lord' (*Congregational Praise*, 322).

familiar: we are faced with a movement bestial and indigenous, but are ourselves partially responsible for the positive hatred of the name of Jesus which characterizes its worst excesses. Nevertheless, we are answerable for the lives, not only of white settlers and missionaries, but also of the far more numerous loyal Kikuyu, who have been the chief sufferers from the emergency.

At this point it is possible to ask an awkward question. How is the distinction drawn between the maintenance by a nation of an army supplied with weapons of mass destruction, and the maintenance of a police force supplied, in this country, with nothing more lethal than truncheons, but backed, if need be, by the power of the military? The answer we give makes little difference now to the other, more terrible question-mark which hangs over us, but it certainly makes a difference to our view of contemporary events in Kenya.

In well-worn theological language, the answer is that we must 'discern the will of God in a particular situation.' But to use theological language would be to obscure the elements which the question has in common with a problem familiar to philosophers—the arbitrary nature of particular moral judgments. It is quite possible to prove the policemen the moral equivalent of the bomber pilot by asking simply, "Why draw the line here rather than there?" The philosopher might have to reply, "We know these two things are different: therefore for argument's sake we will place the boundary here." It is like drawing a line between Devon and Cornwall, or between prose and poetry, a line which it is sometimes difficult to discern when you are out walking on the moor, or reading *The Confidential Clerk*. All Christians may admit that there are measures of force which are wholly necessary for the ordering of society. Society implies rules, and rules imply sanctions. Fines and imprisonments, strikes and mass demonstrations, present their several challenges to the Christian who is invited to condone or to take part in them. A Kikuyu who commits murder is liable to the legal penalty, whatever Christians in the colony may think about capital punishment. It is when murder becomes massacre, discontent rebellion, and the police call in the military, that we are puzzled about our duty. But in the present case the otherwise imperceptible transition from peace to war is marked by the familiar distinction between civil and martial law. The police and the Home Guard are two very different bodies, and the authorities in Kenya have sometimes found this embarrassing.

Nevertheless, it would be absurd to say that the Government has been 'wrong' to suppress this rebellion. Suppose we imagine what Our Lord would have said if He had been asked whether the Romans were right to suppress the rising under Judas which

Gamaliel refers to in *Acts* x. He would not, we may think, have regarded it as a very sensible question. It is also true that the African population would not benefit by our withdrawal from Kenya. But despite this, the failure of Christians in Kenya, failure to dissociate themselves adequately from the secular power which accompanied their missions, failure to enquire closely enough how much can be subtracted from Western Christianity without subtracting Christ from it, may mean that it has become wrong for a Christian to take up arms against a Kikuyu. A settled, friendly colony makes the Church's work, in most respects, easier. But this country owes Kenya a debt which if it is not paid will ensure a colony that may one day be settled, but never friendly. It is a debt which cannot finally be paid by gifts of land or material resources, but which has to be paid, not after the secular power has established order, but while it is doing so.

Perhaps only someone whose ecclesiastical tradition is one of civil disobedience could have arrived at two such bewilderingly opposite conclusions. On the one hand an imperial but officially Christian power is to be commended, or at least not rebuked for suppressing an outbreak of barbarism. On the other hand, this suppression must be finally futile, and by the standards of the Gospel morally wrong, unless that small proportion of the citizens of this power who are Christian are prepared to show in word and deed that the methods of 'Operation Hammer' and the detention camp, though correct for their country, are not right for them.

This is the crux of the matter. It is obviously impossible to pontificate in this way without considering the implications of our decision for a doctrine of the place of a Christian in the social order. It is significant that the most influential of contemporary theologians have arrived at a view of the separate and complementary functions of love and justice, of the Natural Order of Society and the Order of Grace, which, if it does not invalidate, at least renders precarious, the pacifist position. Emil Brunner in *Justice and the Social Order* reminds us that in the main the New Testament uses words like δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη only to reverse what we would normally understand by them. The righteousness of God is the love of God, not the contractual justice of God. The language of Jesus makes it clear that the Kingdom of God must not be confused with problems of earthly justice. But this does not mean that the Christian my be indifferent to these problems. The justice of this world is still God's justice in the sense that the world is still God's world. Hence there is in the New Testament the skeleton of apostolic instruction to Christian communities on 'how, being citizens by faith of another world, they were to behave with regard to the earthly institutions in which, after all, they had to live—

marriage, the family, the relationship of master and servant, the State.' In other words, "Fear God, honour the king."

This description of New Testament architecture is convincing. But it means that when we look in the Bible for direct help on the proper Christian attitude to the distasteful duties laid upon us by the State, we do not always find it. In the Old Testament the problem is almost unknown, for there we have a perfectly self-consistent society in which it is difficult to imagine a conflict of institutional loyalties. In the New Testament we have fragmentary groups, composed of members of many different nations, who were yet so entirely preoccupied with this new society, the Church, which had been called into being by the righteousness of God, that they could scarcely find room in their pastoral letters for remarks on national service. When they did spare a thought for these problems, they borrowed freely from contemporary ethical theory. So it becomes understandable to say that "Fear God, honour the king" is spiritually poles apart from the superficially similar "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's," even though the one is a public turning of an awkward question and the other a considered precept.

But the enormous literature on Church and State which has grown up since Apostolic times shows that the Church could not long remain in primal innocence on this matter. The State makes demands. It expects, and, recently, conscripts a man to serve in the wars. (The Apostolic attitude to the profession of arms hardly arose under the *Pax Romana,* but it is worth noticing that for the first 300 years of Christian history it was looked upon with extreme disfavour, if not as actually incompatible with Christian discipleship. That was their decision, not ours. We cannot tell if their reasons for arriving at it were at all similar to our own.) We find this a problem because we find that the use of violence clashes with our understanding of Christ. No Christian denies the clash: some think it can be resolved, some do not.

Let us examine, then, the theological justification of the call to arms. It says that we are wrong in supposing that the offering of violence to a fellow human being in war is made impossible by our knowledge of Christ's words and actions. We have ignored our status as instruments of justice, which, as it exists in and between States, is also nevertheless not only the justice of men, but the justice of God. Brunner examines the relation and antithesis between justice and love in this important passage:

> Justice is never concerned (as love is) with the human being as such, but only with the human being in relationships. . . . In the world of systems, the Christian cannot give effect to his love except by being just. He remains loving none

> the less, but as long as he is active in the world of systems, his love compels him to be just. Within the world of systems he must, so to speak, change his love into the current coin of justice, since that alone is legal tender in the world of systems. . . .
>
> Hence justice, as compared with love, is not an inferior thing, a thing which should not be. As long as we human beings live in this world, where there are systems, justice is as indispensable as love. This can be seen by the fact that the man of love, as soon as he has to act in the world of institutions, turns his love into justice. He knows that if he did otherwise he would ruin, destroy the world of institutions. Love which is not just in the world of institutions is sentimentality. And sentimentality, feeling for feeling's sake, is the poison, the solvent which destroys all just institutions.[2]

This doctrine is always in danger of being misunderstood when it is applied to a particular problem, such as that of a Christian's duty in Kenya. It is easy for the secular Socialist, for instance, to decide that Brunner means something like this: "The country must be pacified: justice demands it. We must put down the rebellion as gently as possible, then import more Christian missionaries to show the native what love is, to substitute for the impersonal, systematic infliction of justice the personal relationships in which alone love is possible." As an analysis of what goes on in the minds of Europeans in Kenya, this may well be uncomfortably accurate, but as an interpretation of an eminent theologian it will not do. We must ask instead whether the word 'justice' will stand the strain which Brunner puts on it.

The enthronement of justice is as strange to the New Testament as, in a rather different form, it is familiar to the Old. We have glimpsed the reasons for not finding this surprising. But under the weight of its new dignity, the word has become too ambiguous to be useful. Either this justice is merely secular justice, the kind of justice, quite as efficient and often quite as gentle as our own, which the *Pax Romana* gave to the A.D. world in its first century; or else it can only be justice, as it were, with a *caritas superaddita,* justice not natural but revealed, justice with a new, less imperious way of mounting its throne.

The first of these alternatives is unattractive. It says that what we hope to have is secular justice, Christianized perhaps by the leaven within the lump, but justice to which love and grace are irrelevant until it is satisfactorily established. Of this conception Reinhold Niebuhr has said:

> A part of the Church has been ready to elaborate detailed schemes of justice and of law for the regulation of the political

[2] *Justice and the Social Order,* p. 116.

> and social life of mankind, below the level of love and of grace. But it has involved itself in a graceless and inflexible legalism. It does not know that all law can easily be the instrument of sin, that inflexible propositions of justice, particularly in the rapidly shifting circumstances of modern technical development, may hinder rather than help the achievement of true justice.[3]

There remains the second alternative. We must beware of predicating of States what can properly be predicated only of persons. It is not immediately clear what is meant by remarks such as "Our task is to present the Gospel of redemption in Christ to nations as well as to individuals" (Niebuhr). But the Gospel of redemption is not irrelevant to the human being in relationships. And if it is fully realized that the justice imposed by society is only an artifact of the individuals who make up society, and is God's justice in so far as they are made in God's image, we are free to consider where in this system is to be found the *caritas superaddita,* the peculiarly Christian obedience unto death which shall supply the charismatic deficiencies of secular justice when imposed under martial law.

It can be found only in an abnegation of coerciveness which is not and cannot be total, but which in any given situation always goes beyond what is apparently safe and fruitful. This alone makes military service impossible, for armies have to make sure to take no risks. Moreover, no man, one might say, can be simultaneously spear and pruning-hook. Wherever the ultimate right of the matter may be, it is vital to the health of Christian society that there should be those who do not waste their time being beaten from spear to pruning-hook and from pruning-hook to spear, as the exigencies of the latest crisis demand. It is vital that there should be some who find the currency of secular justice too hard for them to change their love into, some who claim the privileges of their citizenship in another world so that the justice of Pilate or Nairobi may be more than the *Pax Romana* or the *Pax Britannica;* may, in fact, come into some relationship with the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. There are never enough pruning-hooks, and "Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?"

Let us turn now from the lesser to the greater, from the chastisement with whips to the chastisement with scorpions. The last section of this article is written to the thesis that the Hydrogen Bomb makes a difference not only to our physical security but to our theology. This is very commonly denied. "The Hydrogen Bomb," they say, "poses no moral issues separate from those posed by the use of other weapons of mass destruction." Now we need be only mildly concerned about the contempt which this

[3] *Christian Realism and Political Problems,* p. 106.

denial earns us from certain left-wing politicians. There would be every reason to be alarmed if all churchmen were admired in *The Tribune* editorial office as Dr. Soper is admired. But far more seriously, this denial is both glib and mistaken. For there are two new factors about the H-bomb. First, it makes possible in the foreseeable future the extinction of life on this planet. Second, it makes nonsense of the concept of 'the just war.'

The first point need not be argued. It was put sufficiently clearly and memorably by Lord Russell in his Christmas broadcast:

> Many warnings have been uttered by eminent men of science and by authorities in military strategy. None of them will say that the worst results are certain. What they do say is that these results are possible; and no one can be sure that they will not be realized. I have not found that the views of experts on this question depend in any way upon their politics or prejudices. They depend only, so far as my researches have revealed, upon the extent of the particular expert's knowledge. I have found that the men who know most are most gloomy. Here then is the problem which I present to you, stark and dreadful and inescapable. Shall we put an end to the human race, or shall mankind renounce war?

We need not discuss how such a possibility ought to influence our eschatological thinking. Traditional English theology stands somewhere between the quietists and the Utopians, somewhere at that point of tension where the Kingdom of God is neither a completely otherworldly event, not yet a state of affairs realizable in human history. But wherever we stand, we cannot be indifferent to the destruction of all that men have built to the glory of God in sixty centuries of civilized existence. However sure we may be that death is preferable to tyranny, we cannot contemplate with equanimity the total erasure of that flesh which the Word became. The scorched earth would indeed remain God's world, but we at least are required to

> Know that the Lord is God alone,
> He can create and He destroy.

For Queen, Church and country to consent to the dropping of this thing might be to assist in racial suicide. It is the final arrogance: it is blowing our own Last Trump.

The second point needs illustration. If the Russians chose tomorrow to invade some territory vital to Western strategy—say Western Germany—the only weapons we could lift against them are atomic ones; and Capt. Liddell Hart has shown that these 'tactical' atomic weapons could not be used for long without their strategical, thermo-nuclear counterparts. Whoever survived, it

would not be Western Germany. Thus wars started with the real or ostensible object of upholding the neutrality of Belgium or the independence of Poland have arrived at a point where they defeat their own end. The *lex talionis,* in international relations, has overreached itself: the necessary force is too great to achieve its object. This reversal can only have a profound effect on our attitude to, for example, Brunner's conception of international justice. For the actual use of the H-bomb can serve only a retaliatory purpose. The fear of its use is doubtless a very salutary force for peace. But should that peace be broken, how could the Christian Church sanction its use either in aggression or in retaliation? There must be some better motive than this, and none exists. The Hydrogen Bomb is more than the arrow writ large: it is the writing on the wall.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to stop there. In few countries is the Church strong enough to dictate to the secular power what weapons will or will not be used in any given circumstances. But even if in this country it were able to do so, we would be placed in an intolerable position. We would be relying on the reluctance of the Russians to provoke any kind of disturbance—and what empirical evidence have we of that?—and on a stock of 'conventional' weapons, economically and socially wasteful, which in the event of war would be useless. This is hardly a policy of Christian expediency. But it is in fact what is implied by the resolution passed by the World Council of Churches last August. "The Hydrogen Bomb should be banned . . . with proper international control and inspection." Either the delegates who agreed to that thought—as most of us think—that proper international control was impossible, and found here an escape-hatch for their consciences; or they believed in its possibility, and were prepared, could the thermo-nuclear threat be removed, to continue the fight with the conventional weapons in which the Russians are definitely our superiors, and to continue the economic and spiritual battle with what small contribution from defence expenditure their respective States could afford to make to the Colombo Plan.

In this situation the attitude of otherwise responsible Christian leaders is difficult to understand. On the one hand we ought to recognize that the peace and comfort of Christian people in the West largely rests on a threat which is made in their name, but which they would have no conceivable justification for implementing, should the need to do so arise. On the other hand, this threat is one which our fellow countrymen, conscious of their citizenship of no mean city, and owning no other allegiance, cannot be blamed for retaining. The threat will, after all, remain with us now so long as evil remains in the world. One can accept this threat and use it

oneself. There are Christians who feel able to do that. There are many more who say that we must resist aggression, without having clearly in their minds the only means by which, in the modern world, it is possible to do so. There are others who, conscious of their treacherous, equivocal position in a society to which they pay taxes and which gives them armed protection, yet feel compelled at once to accept and to disavow that protection; to leave their countrymen to guard themselves, if they can, from the salt-mines and the concentration camps; and in the time that remains to work in God's world, among its political institutions as well as among its displaced persons, so that the final reproach of pacifism, that it is passive, may not be spoken of them. Perhaps Reinhold Niebuhr should have the last word:

> Must we finally choose between atomic annihilation or subjection to universal tyranny? If such a day should come we will remember that the mystery of God's sovereignty and mercy transcends the fate of empires and civilizations. He will be exalted though they perish. However, He does not desire their perdition but rather that they turn from their evil ways and live. From us He demands that we work while it is day, since the night cometh when no man can work.[4]

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 112.

SOME VICTORIAN CHAPEL-BUILDERS

An analysis of 19th Century Congregational Architecture in England.

By Robert Stanley-Morgan, A.R.I.B.A.

The history of Nonconformist church building falls easily into four distinct phases, irrespective of period detail or adornment. The first of these could be called for convenience the 'Geneva' phase. Taking its ideals from strict Calvinistic practice on the Continent, the style is characterized by a pulpit on the short axis of the plan, that is to say, placed centrally against one of the long sides, with the Communion Table centrally in front of it and the congregation, on floor and gallery levels, ranged in front and on either side. This layout was common to many 17th century meeting-houses and was a natural outcome of Puritan practice within the Established Church prior to 1662. Good examples are those at Walpole, Suffolk (*c.* 1647) and, a late instance, at Bury St. Edmunds (Churchgate Street Unitarian Chapel), of 1721. The Church of Scotland retained and developed this particular plan-form more fully than in England and applied it to both town and country churches.

From the second half of the 18th century onwards, the influence of the then-fashionable Anglican plan was felt in the building of meeting houses. The Established Church adopted an aisled building of classical style with galleries in the aisles and over the western entrance. The principal feature internally was a three-decker pulpit placed centrally in front of a shallow chancel recess with the Table relegated to an insignificant position behind.

Wesley was strongly influenced by this in recommending a chapel which should have the pulpit centrally on the long axis, that is, at the far end, facing the entrance, with galleries as necessary on three sides. A significant variation made by the Nonconformists in adapting this arrangement was the omission of the arcades dividing aisles from nave. The roof was given a wide uninterrupted span from wall to wall (at considerable expense) and the galleries were supported on slender columns, often of cast iron.

In this second phase, the rostrum containing the pulpit, etc., assumed great importance and in some cases, as at Newmarket (by Habershon, 1865), was adaptable for secular public meetings. Buildings of this kind were tricked out in both Classic and Gothic dress at the whim of the designer, or to the taste of the church concerned, and there is often incongruity in the result. As a

reaction against this emphasis on the pulpit, Victorian designers occasionally put out feelers in the direction of a more ecclesiastical layout. In the first half of the 19th century there was strong sentiment in Nonconformity against anything which approached a High Church outlook as it was then understood, including the Gothic taste so strongly advocated by Pugin, the Catholic convert, and by the Cambridge Camden Society. Through the years of Victoria's reign and right down to 1939, however, a gradual swing of opinion brought in the period of that strange hybrid, the Nonconformist 'church', barely distinguishable from its contemporary Anglican counterpart. In one particular, however, this kind of building still differed from the typical English parish church. It was one member, the dominant member, of a whole group of buildings, including Sunday Schools and even, in a Liverpool instance, a Working Men's Institute. Unwillingly, perhaps, we are now entering the fourth phase, that of the hall-church. Present circumstances have debarred the erection of spacious halls and schoolrooms adjoining the newest churches and have led to experiments in planning for the church building to serve more than one purpose.

Here is a problem common to all denominations which Nonconformity in general and Congregationalism in particular may find easiest to solve, unhampered by questions of a consecrated or unconsecrated building. The Church has a responsibility not only to provide the maximum facilities for its new causes within very limited budgets, but to do so with sensitivity and grace, preserving the devotional atmosphere proper to a church in a building used also for secular meetings.

This is the context in which the writer would like to consider the architecture of the vast number of Congregational churches built in Queen Victoria's reign. It cannot be denied that many of these buildings are of revolting ugliness and, in consequence, hardly any attempt has been made to treat them as a serious architectural study. This is the more surprising as the Victorian years marked the transition from the old meeting-house to the modern 'ecclesiastical' type of Congregational building, as has been hinted above. Such a transition was by no means a smooth one. In a denomination which eschewed any central controlling influence, the prejudices and foibles of the individual church were naturally reflected in the design chosen for their buildings. The Victorian styles were essentially eclectic, depending more on the whims and fancies of the individual architect than perhaps at any other period. For this reason much of the present account is given over to the careers of some of the leading Victorian architects of Congregational churches.

Building in Wales and Scotland has been deliberately excluded from this study, as the traditions in these countries, particularly in

Wales, followed somewhat different lines. Welsh chapels have a melancholy charm of their own, very different from the sensuous appeal of the High Victorian work in prosperous English suburbs.

Throughout the 19th century one planning problem dogged the steps of the designer of a Nonconformist church, that of ensuring that the preacher, the central figure in the ritual, was audible and visible from all parts of the church. It was, of course, the same question faced by Wren in the City churches. With the increasing congregations in town churches throughout Victoria's reign, it grew in intensity and led to the few outstanding original contributions which Congregationalism made to church planning in the 1870's. The first solution for a medium-sized church down to the 1860's was a squarish plan, bringing the back seats within hearing distance (a reasonable maximum being 60 to 70 feet) and dividing the wide roof span by cast iron columns, which also supported the front of the side galleries. The columns could be of such small diameter as to reduce visual obstruction to a minimum. This eminently practical solution, adopted by those insensitive designers, Thomas Oliver of Newcastle and W. F. Poulton of Reading, soon came under heavy fire on aesthetic grounds and the "starved Gothic" gave way to a new form. The average plan of the 1870's is likely to have shallow transepts and a stone arcade of very wide spans. The smallest possible number of widely-spaced columns is employed, but these columns are necessarily bulky in proportion.

A further development of the 1870's is the use of a Greek cross plan, as at Paull's Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road, Cubitt's Islington Chapel and Sulman's Highbury Quadrant Chapel. These designs are all bold solutions of the problem, which eliminate columns and by their square plan bring large numbers of the congregation close to the preacher. In modern days, their immense scale, coupled with the inflexibility of their plan, is creating economic problems. One or two freak solutions were offered, of course, as for instance the late example of an octagonal chapel at Horton Lane, Bradford, with the one central iron column. This kind of thing had been attempted before by 'Gothic' designers of the Regency period. It is a pity that these bold designers utilized weak and unsuitable Gothic detail and did not maintain in the elevations the fresh and exciting approach shown in the plans.

A second planning problem arose in the 1880's in certain seaside holiday resorts which were then beginning to attract a seasonal population. A flexible plan was required which would enable large congregations to gather in the summer, without making the church seem empty in the winter season, when the 'hard core' of worshippers were left. This question of flexibility is with us today in an even more acute form. Many of the large town chapels of Victorian

times can only be comfortably filled on Festival days, while the majority do not lend themselves to partitioning at other times. The one or two exceptions referred to are therefore of more than usual interest. The choice of outward style for the churches was, of course, capricious. Gothic forms gained a gradual ascendancy over Classic ones during the 1850's, only to give way about 35 years later to eclectic styles such as the 'Queen Anne' under the heady influence of Norman Shaw and the *Art Nouveau* movement. The so-called Italian or Lombardic styles survived for many years side by side with the Gothic, architects working simultaneously in each fashion, with varying success. The title 'Italian' might suggest to the reader a serene Roman style, which is far from these curious hybrids with their 'Venetian' tracery, and their yellow and blue brickwork which 'adorn' otherwise pleasant country towns. The insensitivity of the Victorian church designers to the character and surroundings of the particular neighbourhood is quite astounding. In 1868 (at New Barbican Chapel, London, by Lander and Bedells) a French Gothic church of over-large scale and heavy detail was sandwiched between a charming unobtrusive Regency terrace, the merits of which the Victorians refused to acknowledge, of course. The materials used in the 'High Victorian' period with their curious textures and blatant colours do much to repel the average person who comes into contact with a chapel by Habershon or Poulton for instance.

Such works, fashionable at the time, were influenced by the High Church architect, William Butterfield, and by his theory of "natural colouration" to be obtained by the use of contrasting bands of bricks and tiles which, unfortunately, would not weather or fade. Only in the 1880's, probably due to the growing appreciation of Morris, were natural subtle textures re-introduced into chapel building. Ironically it was in the industrial atmosphere of Hanley that William Sugden built a pioneer church of thin rustic bricks, brown tiles and red Hollington stone dressings.

The strongest influence on designers at the outset of the Victorian era was that of Classic Revival—adapting strict Grecian forms to the diverse needs of 19th century civilization. The Rev. John Blackburn, writing in 1847, recalls that the first Nonconformist chapel to lead in this trend was that at Carrs Lane, Birmingham, where, in 1820, the brilliant but erratic young architect, Thomas Stedman Whitwell, had rebuilt the old meeting house in a grander and more sophisticated form, with a Greek Ionic screen behind the pulpit.

A striking group of Grecian chapels followed in the 1830's and 1840's, among them Great George Street, Liverpool, with its strong resemblance to its gigantic neighbour, St. George's Hall; Crescent Chapel, Everton, probably by the same designer; Albion Street

Chapel, Hull,[1] by H. F. Lockwood; Trinity Church, Poplar, by Hosking, rebuilt after destruction in the last war as a remarkable example of mid-20th century architecture; and the old Westminster Chapel of 1841, rebuilt by the Victorian, W. F. Poulton in 1865. Classical forms survived into the mid-Victorian period, fighting a losing battle against the Goths. Titus Salt's extraordinary enterprise at Saltaire in the '50's included a monumental Congregational church by Lockwood and Mawson of Bradford, and these architects clung to a debased Classical style as late as 1874 for their most notable building, the City Temple.

In Blackburn's view, the improvement in taste over the old 'barn-like' meeting-houses was welcome, as was the new willingness to employ competent designers. The choice of the Greek styles for the 'outer dressing' of the buildings, however, he thought misguided. The basilican architecture of the primitive Church was preferable in his opinion, and he cited the Abbey Road chapel at Torquay as a worthy example to Congregational builders. The use of an arcade between 'nave' and aisles reduced the roof span—and the cost also; side and rear galleries could be conveniently supported and the pulpit placed on the blank end wall. Furthermore, this style was to Blackburn happily free from undesirable ecclesiastical associations. The Victorians abandoned early any attempt to create their own living architecture and relied heavily upon the sentimental associations of the various historical styles.

Gothic forms were, however, acceptable to Blackburn and his contemporaries so long as they could be twisted to serve a distinctly Puritan plan. For one thing, it had been proved possible to build cheaper in Gothic than in Greek, particularly if one used cast iron columns to support both gallery and roof. He drew the line, however, at brick Gothic chapels—exteriors were to be in flint or stone, depending on the district—good advice so often disregarded in the following years. Gothic work commended by Blackburn included the Lancashire College buildings of 1842, by Irwin and Chester, and a remarkable little chapel of 1844 at St. Michael's Hill, Bristol, modelled closely on an English 15th century village church, with a side porch. There was stained glass over the pulpit by the fashionable contemporary artist, Willemant. Few Victorian chapels repeated this experiment until the close of the century. Gothic they might be in outer dress but their plan and outline could never be mistaken for medieval work. From the 1850's onwards, as piety and prosperity increased, the chapels began to sprout towers and lofty spires, placed, not centrally at the west as in the Middle Ages, but offset, generally at one side of the entrance.

[1]Destroyed in the second world war.

The man chiefly responsible for developing this type of steeple for Congregationalism was John Tarring, architect of the Memorial Hall and a prolific designer of Nonconformist chapels from the mid-40's to the late 70's. Tarring's first tower at Clapham in 1853 was in fact placed centrally, like the Regency 'Gothic' towers of the 1820's. By 1863 the corner spire had been developed for Upper Norwood Chapel, but was not executed with the rest of the building. Sevenoaks and St. Ives of 1866 revert to an axial tower, the aisles in the latter case being carried through to enclose the tower on three sides.

At Huntingdon in 1869, Tarring made one of the early excursions into a full ecclesiastical plan, following a lead given by Pritchett at Greenfield, Bradford, two years before and the hint of a chancel by Moffat Smith at Rochdale in 1855. The corner spire at Huntingdon is one of Tarring's lofty efforts, reaching 190 feet from the ground. The church has transepts and a chevet at the east, that is, a rounded east end developed in France in the 12th century and seen best in England at Canterbury and Norwich cathedrals. The walls of this chevet, below the windows, were treated like an Anglican reredos, the organ was tucked out of sight to the left of this, and the choir seated in stalls in the raised chancel. The whole conception was lofty and imposing, the aisles alone reaching a height of 24 feet. It was spoilt, however, by coarse detail and the use of cast iron for the columns. At Exeter[2] in the following year, a watered-down version of the same plan was used, but with the organ in its old-fashioned place in a raised gallery above the pulpit. At Stamford Hill in 1871, however, Tarring achieved a chancel 22 feet long, as well as transepts and an aisled nave. His Stamford Hill spire was a good and expensive piece of work.

Tarring's church at Chapel Street, Blackburn, developed a clumsy little entrance vestibule with a lean-to roof up against the main front wall. This space-saving device was an unfortunate feature of many contemporary chapels and was avoided by Tarring at Enfield, where the entrance was through the base of the steeple. East Finchley (in partnership with Wilkinson) in 1878 shows Tarring in decline; the spire there is much clumsier than the earlier ones and is spoilt by the insertion of a clock.

Joseph James was in my opinion the most sensitive, if not the most inspired, of Congregational architects of the '50's and '60's. The influence of Pugin's care and enthusiasm for Gothic is seen in James's most extensive work, Spring Hill College (1858). At Bexley Heath as early as 1855, James was experimenting with a choir gallery over the entrance vestibule, in the interests of good acoustics, while three years later he offered a German Romanesque

[2]Southernay.

design at Norwich which is one of the few passable examples in this manner. Barnsley, in the preceding year, was more conventional, in an English Gothic dress, but with the use of large areas of glass in the entrance elevation, flanked by a good 'Decorated' spire. My favourite church by James was that at Cambridge Heath (1864)[3]. The side of the church faced the major road and this elevation was treated in a truly architectural way with five gable roofs in a row, running into the main roof in the German fashion, instead of the conventional English clerestory. Each large aisle window had below it a pair of small lancet windows lighting the basement below the church. The east end was an apse the full width of the building, after the manner of Pugin. There was a good spire at the corner where major and minor roads intersect. James's last Congregational church, at Rugby in 1866, is remarkable only for the fact that it was consciously designed to be built in successive stages as funds and requirements should dictate, the building appearing as a complete entity at each successive stage.

William Ford Poulton, of Reading, with his partner, Woodman, is reckoned the most prolific of the mid-Victorian Congregational architects. His elevations and his detailing are hardly inspired, and at his worst he perpetrated some of the worst efforts of his time. A few of his plans, however, are of more than usual interest, and his influence on the trends of Victorian chapel-building was immense, since much of his work was subsidized by the English Congregational Chapel-Building Society, founded in 1853. He did more than anyone to popularize the idea of a raised choir and organ gallery in an apse above the large central pulpit. The space so conveniently provided below this gallery was used for the vestries. This is a layout common to most of Poulton's work, whether in the Gothic or the Italian manner. Poulton's early churches, such as Dorchester (1857) and Bridport of the following year, were on restricted sites and any architectural effort was confined to the front gable wall, for which he was dependent for ideas on the contemporary church work of Gilbert Scott and sometimes that of William Butterfield. Under the influence of the latter, chapels such as Eccles (1860) assumed a strident and aggressive stripiness. The massing of the Eccles building is interesting, though, for having the rear classroom placed at right angles to the chapel, forming together a T-shaped composition. In his larger town churches, notably those on restricted sites such as Preston (1861)[4], Poulton used central roof lighting, and in the same year at Milton, near Sittingbourne, he introduced the first flexible plan. Here the schoolroom took the form of an aisle, separated by columns from

[3]The church ceased to appear in Congregational Year Book in 1936 and it is believed that the building no longer exists.

[4]Lancaster Road.

the chapel, and, on drawing apart sliding-folding partitions, could be used as additional seating for the congregation. Modifications of this idea recur in the following few years at Sawbridgeworth (1863), Ashford (1865) and Godalming (1868) where the classroom, at the rear of the chapel, is placed where it can form a future extension to the church itself. Upper and lower galleries are in evidence at Bishops Stortford (1861) and Lozells, Birmingham (1862), giving a concert-hall character to the interiors, particularly as these churches are without aisles. Poulton churches of the 1870's are poor by comparison, that at Oundle (1872) being in fact a resurrected design from Bridport fifteen years before.

Thomas Oliver, of Newcastle, with his son, Thomas, of Sunderland, was another enterprising provincial designer willing to set his hand to any style of work, and advertising in 1856 "A series of twenty designs for New Chapels in the Gothic, Italian, Byzantine and Norman Styles of Architecture, erected in various Counties in England and Scotland and suitable for Towns, Suburbs and Villages." He is credited with developing the cast iron arcade, consisting of columns and arches with wooden framing above, giving intermediate support to wide roof spans and picking up the weight of the side galleries on the way up. Early use was made of this construction at Middlesborough[5] in 1857.

Rail travel in the 19th century made it easier for London designers to undertake and supervise work in many different parts of the country and the growth of the competition system further weakened the position of the local architects. In Nonconformist church building, however, down to the late 19th century, minor provincial architects, by the sheer mass of work they built, retained a greater influence than men like James Cubitt and Alfred Waterhouse, who made occasional excursions into chapel-building, the latter with a great triangular chapel at Ancoats in 1866.

Cubitt's gigantic Union Chapel, Islington, with its conception of the Greek cross plan for a Congregational church, is really a development of an idea by W. G. Habershon at Camberwell New Road Chapel as early as 1857. In the preceding year, Habershon had experimented with an octagonal plan at the Canonbury Chapel, Islington, with seats radiating from the pulpit.

A further experiment, which sprang from the fertile soil of Islington in 1857, was the Offord Road Chapel by Lander and Bedells, another octagon with a central roof-light. This firm worked in and around London in the 1860's and were later responsible for the design of Cheshunt College in 1875.

The first two chapels by Pritchett of Darlington, Knaresborough

[5]St. George's.

and Hillhouse, Huddersfield, were built to designs successful in competition in 1865. Pritchett was largely influenced by G. E. Street, but had foibles of his own. One of these was a starved corner spirelet or pinnacle, the outside of which was splayed or chamfered back about two-thirds of the way up. More important than this was the departure he made in the plan for Greenfield Chapel, Bradford (1867). Not only was a separate chancel provided but the pulpit was moved to one side and balanced by a lectern. The communion table was given the position of the altar, being moved forward for the Communion service, while the choir was also seated in this chancel. At Ilkley in the following year the pulpit, once the focus of all attention, had shrunk into a small reading-desk.

H. J. Paull, of Manchester, chiefly remembered as architect of Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road, and John Sulman, of Furnival's Inn, London, are the two outstanding figures of our story in the 1870's. James Tait, of Leicester, and T. L. Banks are among their imaginative lesser brethren. Paull began chapel building unsurely in the 1860's, flirting with various exotic styles. Eastborough Chapel, Scarborough, of 1870, is the first remarkable building of his. The church floor level is set 18 feet above the road, with a broad covered stairway, above which on the first floor is the lecture room, separated from the church by a light-well ten feet wide. Ripponden, Yorks, of the same year, is a small country chapel where Paull has used steps in the vestibule to similarly good effect. In 1873, Paull was given one of the early 'restoration' jobs in refitting and extending the historic Dunkinfield Chapel at Ashton-under-Lyne.

Westminster Bridge Road, and Cubitt's Union Chapel, Islington, are the two outstanding solutions to the problem of Congregational planning, and both date from the 1870's, when congregations were large and funds were ample. (Westminster Bridge Road cost £45,000.) Each employs variations of the Greek cross plan, the arms meeting at an octagonal lantern which, in Paull's work, was vaulted and at Islington had a painted wooden ceiling. Externally a large tower forms a dominant part of the composition, the Westminster spire rising, in fact, to 220 feet. The enormous arches supporting each lantern roof were cleverly braced by the gallery fronts which formed an integral part of the whole design, instead of appearing as afterthoughts. At Westminster Bridge Road dual pulpits or 'ambones' were employed, flanking the steps up to the raised Communion table; organ and choir flanked the communion recess (it was too shallow to be reckoned as a 'chancel'). At Islington, on the other hand, the large pulpit retained its central

position with the seats radiating from it. The choir had a diminished importance here, as the congregation were all taught to sing in four-part harmony.

A close relative of these two designs is Highbury Quadrant Chapel, London, by John Sulman (1881) where an actual lantern roof was used to give light to the centre of the interior. The plan is a Greek cross again with the internal angles built up at low level to form aisles. Sulman's best work was done at a time when conventional 'arcades', particularly those of cast iron, were falling out of favour and at Caterham in 1875 he develops the idea of very wide transepts of shallow projection in order to centralize the congregation around the preacher. The transept is so wide in fact that two arches are needed between it and the 'nave'. At Croydon in 1877, Reedham in 1878 and Barnet in 1879, these two arches have been used again but now they span between them the whole length of the church. In two of these plans the vestibule is pressed into service for additional seating space, by removing a folding screen. Sulman was fortunate in his clients, for the scope offered in districts like Croydon or Bromley was enviably wide. By 1880 when the Bromley church was built, Sulman was well established, and this large mass of buildings with its rich silhouette and crisp detail shows how much he owed to George Gilbert Scott, Jnr. His own particular weakness was for external statues, which adorn many of his buildings.

All this time he was experimenting with internal arrangements, moving the organ into a transept at Bromley and Addiscombe, and arranging the pulpit and choir seats side by side in the Sanctuary at Olney. The Bromley work has many points of interest, including the narrow cloisters alongside the church, fore-shadowing the Poplar church of 1951, the transept-like projections near the entrance and, on the planning side, the way in which the group was erected in stages, so that the congregation might worship in the new school while the old chapel was being demolished and the new one built.

At Teignmouth in 1881, Sulman placed his western gallery behind a screen so that this could be curtained off when not in use during the winter; a future school was also planned alongside for similar treatment, while the transepts at Westgate,[6] a church of 1882, were designed in the same way. Ironically, one of Sulman's best elevations, at Addiscombe, is a temporary one, allowing for a future extension towards the street. In his last phase, Sulman passed from the influence of Scott to that of Bodley and Garner. His charming 15th century inspired group at Winslow (1884) is the first since the Bristol example of 1844 to be modelled on an English village church—the wheel had come full circle in 40 years.

[6]Westgate-on-Sea, Kent.

James Tait, of Leicester, had, for a provincial man, a very wide practice and, although his planning is unadventurous, his exterior treatments show sensitivity and an original mind. In his early work at Grantham in 1870 he improved the aspect of the corner spire by detaching it from the main church, except for a low corridor-link at ground level. Great Malvern in 1874 cleverly resolves the change in level on a hilly site, where the slender spire shows to good advantage. By 1882 at Park Hill, Nottingham, Tait was producing 14th century detail equal to Sulman's best.

T. L. Banks followed Tait's lead in detaching his tower at Oakhill, Bath, in 1872, but the outward style is quite different—Ruskinian Gothic of the most blatant kind with a multi-coloured diaper-patterned roof. Whitehaven (also 1872) is similarly repellent but the idea of keeping the galleries behind a row of arches like a cathedral triforium gives a striking and by no means displeasing interior. Banks' own solution to the 'central' plan at Leytonstone in 1877 was a Greek cross with an apse on each arm of the cross. The central space, free from columns, was supported on massive pendentives at high level. Another Greek cross by Banks, St. James' chapel, Newcastle-on-Tyne, has a large octagonal lantern; the organ was tucked away so as to be barely visible (or audible?).

The culmination of the 'ecclesiastical' plan for Congregational churches was reached in 1897 with the new Albion Chapel, Newcastle-under-Lyme, by John Brooke, of Manchester. Here once more is the conventional arcade in stone, returned after banishment in the 1840's. The aisles, however, are merely narrow passages and contain no seating. The wide roof is spanned by hammer-beam trusses, crowning a lofty clerestory. The corner steeple reaches 220 feet, like that at Westminster Bridge Road, and there are all the ecclesiastical trappings—a distinct chancel with a large east window, the glass by William Morris and Burne-Jones, and angels on the hammer beams. The cost was £50,000!

The dates quoted are those of publication in the *Congregational Year Book* and may pre-date or post-date the erection of the buildings by a year or two.

THE LORD PROTECTOR:
Reflections on Dr. Paul's Life of Cromwell

By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D.

Oliver Cromwell's life demands a retelling in every generation; and fortunate is he who is called to the task—called he must be, else the task were too formidable—for of popular interest he is assured. The framework of Dr. Paul's book, as the twenty chapter-titles at once indicate, is straight biographical narrative; and very good narrative it is, palling a trifle at times with the cumbersomeness of the detail, but never for long: the interest is well sustained. While availing himself of the great four-volume edition of Cromwell's *Writings and Speeches* issued from Harvard University by Professor W. C. Abbott between 1937 and 1947, Dr. Paul would seem to have discovered no facts unknown to previous biographers. He would not, I think, claim to have done this. His intention was, rather, to concentrate on the mutual relationship of religion and politics in Cromwell's life. To some extent no serious student of Cromwell can do otherwise; but Dr. Paul's especial purpose is to resolve the 'contradiction' which he sees between "the Independent who held 'democratic' ideas in ecclesiastical matters" and the man who "ended by becoming an absolute dictator." Cromwell's "Independent or Congregational churchmanship," he says, "appears to run counter to so much within his life."

This carries the promise, which is not belied, of a fascinating study. Dr. Paul's resolution of the problem, put briefly, is as follows. Cromwell had the courage and the consistency to carry into public and political life the doctrine of Providence which as a guide for private life was shared by all Puritans—and by others also, for it was "no Puritan monopoly." He believed that the God whose mighty acts are declared in Scripture still makes His will known in and through events; and that His intervening and overruling will is especially plain when what has happened for good is strange, unexpected and undesigned by human wills, and when the persons He has used as His instruments are weak in themselves but free from self-seeking in the desire to serve Him. In the power of this conviction Cromwell mounted high; or, in Biblical language, went from strength to strength. "I sought not this place," he constantly avers; "I speak it before God, angels and men; I did not." "I called not myself to this place; I say again, I called not myself to this place." "There is ne'er a man within these walls

that can say, Sir, you sought it." Cromwell knew himself to be "a miserable and wretched creature," "a poor worm"; but "I do feel myself lifted on by a strange force, I cannot tell why." "By the providence of God it is perfectly come to pass, not by our wisdom, for I durst not design it, I durst not admit of so mixed, so low a consideration." "I profess his very hand has led me. I preconsulted none of these things."

This assurance that the course of his own career fulfilled God's will, and this criterion for the assurance, Cromwell felt equally strongly and applied with equal vigour in relation to the career of the army. "Wherever they engaged the enemy," he said of his men, "they beat them continually;" and it was true: in Frederic Harrison's words, "no single operation of war that he ever undertook had failed." "Sir," wrote Cromwell, "what can be said to these things? Is it an arm of flesh that doth these things? . . . It is the Lord only. . . Sir, you see the work is done by divine leading." "Because of our weakness," he wrote of his victory at Dunbar, "because of our strait, we were in the Mount, and in the Mount the Lord would be seen." Of the whole course of events he claimed that there was "a remarkable print of Providence set upon it, so that he who runs may read it."

In relation to the career of the nation, in its civil and parliamentary aspect after the battle of Worcester, the assurance proved more difficult to hold, the criterion to apply. The weakness of successive Parliaments seemed something nearer "weakness and folly;" and the only way God seemed to over-rule their incompetence was by further magnifying Cromwell himself. In C. H. Firth's words, "it sufficed for him to remain passive, and power came back to his hands by a sort of natural necessity."[1] Cromwell found himself increasingly over against the other leaders of the people, even in opposition to them. But had not this been regularly the case with the prophets and with those set over the Lord's people? "Be not afraid of their words, nor be dismayed at their looks, though they be a rebellious house," he read in *Ezekiel.* "The paradox which exists between Cromwell the Independent and Cromwell the Lord Protector . . . was resolved in the 'prophetic' function of Cromwell's political mission." Increasingly he saw himself prefigured by Moses or by David. "In place of the Divine Right of Kingship, a new Divine Right of Vocation was asserted," still "founded squarely upon the doctrine of Providence."

This is well argued. It was well argued in less compass, more than fifty years ago, by R. F. Horton, whose *Oliver Cromwell: a study in personal religion* was in its tenth thousand in 1899; but

[1] C. H. Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England* (1935 edn.), p. 340. I add references only for passages from modern works not in Dr. Paul's book.

Horton's book is forgotten—Dr. Paul does not mention it—and it is good to have the argument set out afresh. How far, I want to go on to ask, does Cromwell's fundamental conviction correspond to any conviction we hold ourselves?

"There was a direct N and halfe of M providentially made upon my breeches plaine to view in any mans sight, made of mire with leaping," a Puritan wrote in his diary in 1663, at a time when the object of his desires bore the name of Mary Naylor; "I looked upon it to be from providence and fortold somethinge in my apprehension, the smallest of God's providences should not be past by without observation."[2] I remember another Puritan diarist who sought to interpret the 'providence' manifested in the cat's jumping on to his mother's lap. The underlying attitude of mind, and consequently the faith, expressed here is evidently different from anything common among us to-day. Whether it is for 'natural law' or for chance or for both that we make room, we are shy of seeing divine intervention in the natural or the trivial. Yet we still, most of us, believe that we may have God's hand upon us for good, and may know when we have it; and we are still inclined to think that a call to a pastorate, or an invitation to some other task, is more likely to be of God if it is one we did not seek.

Probably, although in theological circles the difference between God's ways and men's ways has of late been made sharper, in day-to-day practice we make it less sharp than did Cromwell and his contemporaries. I fancy we allow reason and 'the normal' a larger place in our deciding what course is right; although Cromwell could say, "what God would have us do, he does not desire we should step out of the way for it." We see that too pronounced a dualism, too keen a fear of reason, may lead paradoxically through the atrophying of the critical faculty, to something near an identification between God's ways and men's. To "suffer others to magnifie him" might acquit Cromwell of all self-seeking and yet lead him into as strange a place, as far from lowliness, as it led James Nayler, when Nayler suffered others to pay him Messianic honours, for it is of Nayler (as well as of St. Bernard) that one thinks when one reads that Cromwell "completely identified his cause with the Will of God."

Probably, for these and other reasons, we are more aware of the difficulties and perils in interpreting God's will in events than Cromwell was; although Cromwell, again, could say, "How easy is it to find arguments for what we would have"; "uprightness, if it be not purely of God, may be, nay commonly is, deceived"; and "mercies should not be temptations; yet we too oft make them so."

[2]Roger Lowe, *Extracts from a Lancashire Diary, 1663-1678* (Manchester, 1876), p. 11.

Certainly, we are more aware of the particular danger in equating God's will with success, in the unredeemed sense of the word. We feel the force of the words of a Republican which Dr. Paul quotes: "God in his providence doth often permit of that which he doth not approve; and a thief may make as good a title to every purse which he takes by the highways." Even more penetrating is the comment of another of Cromwell's contemporaries, a conforming clergyman:

> For a long time their talk was of providence, and their successes. First, their cause was God's cause, which he would prosper for their sakes (his people, his secret ones) and for his promises, whereof they had a large stock in the Old Testament and the Revelations. This had a strong smack of prophaneness. Then God prospered their cause, therefore it was God's cause, a pure Mahometan conclusion. Now that it's at a loss, the note is (and mark it, I beseech you) God in the ways of his providence towards us walks in the dark.[3]

This may be regarded as too unsympathetic; yet we cannot help being stirred uneasily by Richard Baxter's judgment that Cromwell "meant honestly in the main . . . till Prosperity and Success corrupted him." We cannot forget, moreover, that the success in which Cromwell primarily saw God's will revealed was a military success. Few of us to-day can say as easily as he, "War is good when led to by our Father."

The paradox is that it was not until after his last battle was won that Cromwell "began to doubt."[4] It is true that victorious generals are not normally good civilian administrators. How should they be? Yet, unless Dr. Paul's whole thesis is mistaken, Cromwell was not just another victorious general; he was fundamentally a man of God, seeking and (till now) finding God's will and way. Why is it that, after the dissolution at the end of 1653 of the Nominated Parliament, which S. R. Gardiner justly calls "the high-water mark of Puritanism,"[5] Cromwell stumbles and never really recovers himself, so that the title of this book, *The Lord Protector*,[6] is in a sense the label of a tragedy? "The failure of the

[3]John Shaw, *No Reformation of the Established Religion* (1685), as quoted in *Memoirs of . . . Ambrose Barnes*, ed. W. H. D. Longstaffe (Surtees Soc., L, 1867), p. 410. Over the offer of the crown in 1657 Cromwell said, "who can love to walk in the dark? But Providence doth often so dispose."

[4]C. H. Firth, *Oliver Cromwell*, p. 335.

[5]S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* (1903 edn.), ii, 340.

[6]Was the title meant to refer back to the Protector Somerset? and did Cromwell admire, and even imitate Somerset, who had many characteristics similar to his own? cf. A. F. Pollard's summing up on Somerset in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*: "Strength of conviction and purity of motives admirably fitted him to lead a religious movement. . . . As a general he was successful in every military operation he undertook. . . . He lacked patience, hated compromise and consistently underrated the strength of the forces opposed to him. . . . Under his sway there was less persecution than there was again for a century. . . . Naturally warm-hearted and affable, the possession of power rendered him peevish and overbearing."

Nominated Parliament," Dr. Paul observes, ". . . meant disillusionment." In Cromwell's speech opening the following Parliament, "the note of something even akin to despair was not entirely absent." Later, over the offer of the Crown, Cromwell is "obviously perplexed in his own mind," "a bewildered man": "was this the Supreme Call or the Great Temptation?" In language which Cromwell would have understood, if James Nayler had used it to him (as Nayler came to do of himself), Cromwell can be seen to have "lost his guide," to be "running before his guide." Why was this?

Apart from the providence of God as revealed in events, Cromwell's guidance, like that of most of the Puritans, came from a three-fold source: it came from the word of God in Scripture, from the answering word of the Spirit in his own heart, and from the support and restraint of God's people. Throughout his book Dr. Paul has done a most valuable service by indicating many of the Biblical references which underlie all Cromwell's thought and language; but he offers no critique of Cromwell's use and application of Scripture. What justification had Cromwell for seeing himself prefigured by Moses or David, for believing that "they were passing through the events foretold in the 110th Psalm" and that Psalm 68 was prophetic of "the existing condition of the Church," or for holding that "the dispensations of the Lord have been as if he had said, England thou art my firstborn?" We feel uneasy about such 'British-Israel' applications of Scripture. Yet we continue to believe that the Bible has an immediate relevance to ourselves and our day; that Christ's words to John, say, are also to every man Jack among us. This is a subject which requires a study to itself, or at least a chapter to itself in a study of the use of Scripture by the Puritans in general, including the Quakers. Perhaps Principal Cunliffe-Jones will one day write it for us?

Secondly, Cromwell formed the habit of "a waiting posture, desiring to see what the Lord would lead us to"; he feared to tempt God by "acting before and without faith," and consequently often retired "for a quarter or halfe an hower" before coming to a conclusion. "I can be passive and let it go, knowing that innocency and integrity lose nothing by a patient waiting upon the Lord." This "period of inactivity" "before making a big decision" Dr. Paul, who is inclined to play down what he calls "the mystical element in Cromwell's religion," finds "very difficult to explain." It did not seem so to T. H. Green, who in a letter to Scott Holland in 1869 could describe "what Cromwell used to call 'a waiting spirit'" as "the highest."[7] Whether difficult to understand or not, it was certainly fundamental to Cromwell's piety, and,

[7]Stephen Paget, *Henry Scott Holland* (1921), p. 32.

together with recourse to Scripture, continued to be so to the end.

What after 1653 was increasingly lacking was the third source of his guidance, the support and restraint of God's people. Dr. Paul brings out clearly the significance of Cromwell's loss of the "intimate Christian fellowship" which he had known in the army. At the same time, many of Cromwell's friends and supporters, the same who later vehemently opposed his acceptance of the crown, were already opposed to his accepting the title of Protector. This may be illustrated from a text in no way extreme, the church book of Broadmead Church, Bristol: "Oliver Cromwell, called Lord Protector when as God alone was ye Protector of his people; but we sinned."[8] It is tragic that parliamentary incompetence and Cromwell's consequent supremacy thus synchronized with his friends' alienation and his consequent isolation, but so it was: the one thing which might have saved him was missing. The occasion when George Fox went to see him and, as Fox puts it, "he catcht mee by ye hande & saide these words with teares in his eyes, Come againe to my house," has an added poignancy from its date, March 1655, when his sense of isolation was growing acute. Thereafter the hardness of heart which he actually discussed with Fox at their meeting quickly descended upon him: later that same month another Friend wrote, "his heart is hardened, and he cannot believe." Nor is this simply the biassed judgment of a Quaker; "a hard heart had further hardened" is the judgment on him at this time of Lambert's biographer.[9] So fatal for him was separation from the fellowship of God's people.

Cromwell's isolated position from 1654 onwards has been commented on from another angle by one of the most perceptive students of English religion, John Stoughton. "It is very remarkable," Stoughton writes, "that no ecclesiastical personage appears controlling the affairs of the Commonwealth. . . . We strive in vain to detect any clerical guidance."[10] Dr. Paul makes out that Cromwell "relied on the advice and services of . . . clergymen like John Owen, Philip Nye and Thomas Goodwin" and calls Owen "Cromwell's chief adviser in ecclesiastical affairs." While it is true, in general terms, that "Owen and his friends took the lead in the ecclesiastical affairs of the country," I think that in relation to Cromwell and the administration Stoughton's judgment is sounder: "Independents were about his person, but no evidence exists of his constituting any of them ecclesiastical advisers. . . . Owen and

[8] *The Records of a Church of Christ meeting in Broadmead, Bristol,* ed. N. Haycroft (1865 edn.), p. 37.

[9] W. H. Dawson, *Cromwell's Understudy: the life and times of General John Lambert and the rise and fall of the Protectorate* (1938), p. 286.

[10] John Stoughton, *History of Religion in England* (1881 edn.), ii, 88.

Goodwin were too much engaged at Oxford to have many opportunities for conference at Whitehall. Philip Nye . . . was not the person to carry weight with Oliver." Over the cardinal issue of liberty of conscience, moreover, Cromwell certainly went much further than Owen and the 'Dissenting Brethren' thought desirable. "They who are for a Congregationall way, doe not hold absolute liberty for all religions," Dr. Paul quotes from Jeremiah Burroughes. To Cromwell, on the other hand, the remarkable saying is attributed, "I had rather that Mahometanism were permitted among us than that one of God's children should be persecuted." Dr. Paul quotes this too; he does not observe, however, that the tract from which it is taken, like Milton's *Sonnet* to Cromwell, which he also quotes, was written directly in opposition to the "Fundamentals of Religion" which Owen had put out with a view to excluding, as Baxter complained, both Papists and Socinians.

This inclination to claim for Owen too great a share in Cromwell's ecclesiastical administration arises, I think, from Dr. Paul's keen desire to claim Cromwell as a Congregationalist, which appears throughout his book. He admits that Cromwell's name is never "connected with any particular local Church;" but he points to Baxter's words in his autobiography, the *Reliquiae Baxterianae,* that Cromwell's "Officers purposed to make their Troop a gathered Church, and they all subscribed an Invitation to me to be their Pastor," and also to the reference to this passage in the index to the *Reliquiae,* which reads, of Cromwell, "he invites Mr. Baxter to be Chaplain and Pastour to his Regiment when he was forming it into a Church." This, Dr. Paul claims, "resolves the mystery of his churchmanship." Is that really the case? It is, surely, dangerous to build on an isolated piece of phrasing, especially since the form of words in the index to the *Reliquiae* would not be chosen by its editor till as late as 1696. C. H. Firth, in a careful consideration of the passage and its significance, sums up more cautiously: "in spite . . . of all that Baxter and other Presbyterians say against Cromwell's troopers, it must not be supposed that all, or even the majority of them, belonged to the extremer sects of Independents."[11] Baxter attributes his invitation to become the troop's chaplain to his friend, James Berry, then Cromwell's captain-lieutenant and later one of the Major-Generals; and of Berry's religious affiliation his biographers write: "like his leader, Cromwell, Berry, although he may be classified as an Independent, seems never to have identified himself very closely with any one

[11] C. H. Firth and Godfrey Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army* (1940), ii, 35. Firth also sensibly asks, "who became chaplain of Cromwell's regiment when Baxter refused?", but says the answer "is uncertain."

particular sect."[12] Lambert's biographer says much the same of Lambert: "ecclesiastical labels and doctrinal shibboleths had no attractions for him;" "he was never known to have openly avowed adhesion to any one of the many rival ecclesiastical systems of the day."[13] Milton is another who, from the section on the nature of the Church in his *De Doctrina Christiana* as well as from the passionate plea for liberty of conscience in his *Areopagitica,* may be ranked with the Independents, yet who is not known to have been a member of any church.

It is true that as early as 1644 Cromwell is called by Robert Baillie "a known Independent;" while in 1658 Hugh Peter writes to Henry Cromwell, "Your father dyed as he lived an Independent."[14] The difficulty is that, while all Congregationalists were Independents, not all Independents were Congregational; and, although there was a fully organized Congregational church worshipping regularly as close to Whitehall as the Abbey, no contemporary, so far as I know, ever placed Cromwell among "the Congregational men" or charged him with being of "the Congregational way." The appointment of the 'Triers' and other ministerial Commissions reflects the same position and purpose as Cromwell's frequent calling of ministerial conferences for discussion: while the Congregational men are in a majority, neither Presbyterians nor Baptists are excluded. What Cromwell sought to be, as Dr. Paul well brings out, was, in Cromwell's own words, "a good constable to keep the peace of the parish;" and the constable must be of no party. Unfortunately Cromwell's being the sole constable made him appear to be, in the eyes of others and perhaps increasingly in his own, above the law. The very real Christian fellowship which may be found among men with a common, but special and temporary purpose, such as the troopers of Cromwell's army, is not the same as that of a church, which consists of both men and women, all living their ordinary lives, with nothing to bind them together except their faith.

Cromwell's *not* being a Congregationalist, in the sense of being a member of a particular church, and (I believe) his never having been one, was in fact a contributing factor in the tragedy of his eventual isolation and bewilderment and in the consequent hardening of his spirit.

The critical reader may therefore be justified in questioning Dr. Paul's initial premisses; and, while it is doubtful if he succeeds in his attribution to Cromwell of "Congregational churchmanship," it

[12]Sir James Berry and S. G. Lee, *A Cromwellian Major-General: the career of Colonel James Berry* (Oxford, 1938), p. 270.

[13]W. H. Dawson, *Cromwell's Understudy,* p. 167.

[14]*Letters and Documents by or relating to Hugh Peter,* ed. R. P. Stearns (Essex Institute Hist. Coll., lxxiii, 1, Jan., 1937), p. 143.

is still stranger that he should say, even by way of introduction, that Cromwell "ended by becoming an absolute dictator." Fortunately, in the last sentence of the book, in a bold criticism of W. C. Abbott's interpretation of Cromwell, Dr. Paul writes that "whatever else Cromwell was, he was not a dictator in our modern understanding of that word." Even from the constitutional aspect, as he shows, this is true. "The Lord Protector had no right of veto"; "Parliament should be summoned should the Lord Protector fail to summon it himself"; and "although it was usual for the wishes of the Protector to be obeyed, it was not an invariable rule." At a deeper level the charge of dictatorship is undercut by the whole argument of the book. It is this, the careful and sympathetic interpretation of Cromwell's "prophetic mission" and "Divine Right of Vocation," which, with certain qualifications, evokes admiring assent, and by which the book will live; and live I think it will.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

By E. C. Blackman, M.A., B.D.

The question of the relation between Christianity and culture is perpetually relevant. What contribution has Christianity made to civilization during these last nineteen centuries, and what can it still make in the future? There can be highly developed civilization without Christianity, as is clear from the ancient Hellenistic world into which it was born and from the civilizations of India and China down to the present day. Some Christians have maintained a negative attitude to the world's culture, as if it were necessarily tainted and only the world to come can be regarded as God's kingdom and the Christian's home. The gentle humanism expressed in Terence's line: "I am a man, and nothing human is beyond my interest" is inverted to something like "I am a Christian; everything human is below my interest." But Christian opinion generally would not subscribe to this fundamental alienation. In fact Christianity has been world-embracing as well as world-renouncing.

Professor Carl Schneider of Speyer has recently published two bulky volumes which illuminate this great theme. The work is entitled *The History of Ancient Christianity in the intellectual and spiritual spheres*.[1] It is not Church history in the ordinary sense, nor even the history of Christian doctrine; but a study of the impact of Christianity on the culture of its ancient Roman-Hellenistic environment for roughly five centuries. How much did Christianity contribute to that ancient and by no means uncivilized world? How much did it borrow from it? If it did borrow from its surrounding culture or from rival religions, what does that borrowing imply? Was Christianity itself transformed in the process, or was the original deposit of "faith once for all delivered to the saints" conserved through all superficial borrowings and adaptations? Starting within Judaism, how did Christianity become a world-religion? Wherein lay its power to establish itself (*Durchsetzungskraft*) among so many peoples far from its original home?

Such questions as these are not of merely historical interest. The power of Christianity to claim men's allegiance on a world-

[1] *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums.* (The first word defies exact translation in English.) Verlag C. H. Beck, München.

wide scale would appear to be in the balance at the present time, when the need of a common culture which can reconcile divergences and remove the threat of war is manifest and clamant. In this connection the study of how early Christianity effected these ends is not purely academic. Our need today is for a religion which can synthesize the aspirations of scientists and nationalists and ordinary folk and direct them to a higher goal. Christianity presented itself in those earlier centuries as a worthier faith than Emperor-worship. Today it is confronted by a tougher rival in Communism. To which will the future belong?

Professor Schneider illustrates how the Church's conception of God as Love with its direct inspiration on conduct was a main source of its appeal. But the secret of success was more complex than that. Why for example were soldiers attracted to it? There were pacifists among the Christians, but other aspects of the Christian religion converted N.C.O.'s and colonels of the Roman armies, and it is not without significance that settlements of veterans were promising seed-beds of the faith. The attraction of Christianity for other social types—manual and agricultural workers, jurists, medical men, women, old people, slaves—is described in many fascinating pages. Considering the ancient world in its national groupings Schneider shows how Christianity was more successful than its rival faiths in achieving real supra-nationality. This was effected not by a denial of the fact of nationhood or suppression of national characteristics, but even in some cases by fostering their self-expression. This is best illustrated in the development of national literatures, starting with the translation of the Bible into the language of the new converts. Modern missionary enterprise offers many parallels. Schneider points out that it was the Greek and Byzantine sections of the Church that stimulated this development, whereas Latin Christianity took no initiative in it. No translation was made into a Berber (N. Africa) language nor into Celtic; and the German version came not from Rome or Gaul, but from Byzantium.

Generally, there was a confidence and an optimism about the early Christians which powerfully attracted their contemporaries everywhere. Their sense of being 'a third race,' reborn by baptism, was a youthfulness of spirit capable of rejuvenating a world which had grown old.

After summarizing the New Testament teaching Schneider proceeds to describe the development of Christianity in its environment in terms of the inner forces at work as the basic Christian ideas and those of contemporary religion and philosophy reacted upon one another. This involves more than the evolution of Christian doctrine and ethics. Prof. Schneider introduces us to the

mysticism, theosophy and magic of those centuries, and, in masterly fashion, to the feeling-world which conditioned it all. All this he calls, in distinction from Church history, "structure-analysis." There follows an assessment of the effect of Christianity among the various peoples of the Roman Empire, and upon the various natural and social distinctions. Next Schneider surveys the development of Christian literature, the Arts (including Architecture), Liturgy and Church Organization.

All through we have the distinctive Christian contribution made clear, but the total background is shown up at the same time. Its need of the Christian influence was sometimes more, sometimes less. Christianity itself was prepared to receive as well as give. One sometimes gets the impression that Schneider sees no difference between the Greek spirit at its best and the Christian at its best. He certainly rates the Greek genius much higher than the Latin, and he shows definite distaste for the African type of Latin. His heroes are the leading Greeks both pre-Christian and Christian, and supreme among them Plato and Origen. Augustine gets a poor mark, though his greatness is recognized. He is called an "apostle of intolerance." The best type of Christianity was that of Alexandria under the influence of Clement and Origen, its 'Christian Platonists,' who achieved the ideal union of faith and scholarship, rationalism and mysticism.

Christianity both influenced its Hellenistic environment and was influenced by it. The facts are double-sided, and it is uncritical to claim the first and ignore the second. Over-simplification is nowhere more absurd than here. Enthusiastic apologists like C. L. Brace (*Gesta Christi*) and superior scholars like Gibbon ("We have witnessed the triumph of barbarism and religion!") are equally far from the truth. Schneider is more truly scholarly. He admits that Christianity always shows marks of the environment in which it finds itself, and that a "pure Christianity" is at no period to be found.[2] This is not surprising, but an inevitable result of historical existence.

Schneider draws up a balance between what Christianity took from and gave to the thought-world of Greece and Rome. The fairness and objectivity of his treatment are noteworthy, as also is his familiarity with the scholarly literature dealing with that ancient world, including recent studies in several languages. In the first place, Platonism was christianized. "The union of Christianity with Platonism is among the most fortunate events in the history of European culture."[3] The Platonic distinction of Idea and Matter became the Christian distinction of God and World. The Ideas were regarded as Divine attributes. The subordinate Creator of

[2]Vol II, 282. [3]Vol. II, 284.

Plato's *Timaeus* was identified with the Biblical Creator, self-seeking Eros was transformed into God-seeking Agape. For the descent of the Ideas the Christian had the Incarnation, and for the ascent of man to contemplation of the Ideal world the Christian had mystical communion with Christ. The Platonist's Anamnesis of the Ideal World was no longer necessary for the Christian who in the Eucharist had part in sacramental acts in memory (anamnesis) of his Redeemer.

Stoicism similarly had to submit to Christian transformation. Christians had the historic figure of Christ in place of the truly Wise Man, and the personal Father to worship instead of Stoic pantheism. There was the Mosaic Law for the Stoic Law of Nature, and the series of divine revelations culminating in Christ, where the Stoic thought of the activity of Logos or World-Reason. In place of the Utopian Stoic conception of a cosmopolitan world-state the Christian could point to the actually existent world-wide Church; and the Stoic demand for the suppression of the emotions had no meaning for one who knew the love of God and was fully occupied in loving his fellow men.

So much for the two major philosophies of the time. Over the more popular philosophies Christianity showed the same transforming power. It could make use of them all—after rejecting much that was in flat contradiction to the Gospel—as part of the basis of its own high doctrine. This, together with its claim to be the absolute truth and the final religion, made a great impression, even though it offended the traditional Greek feeling for moderation. Christianity's ability to absorb the best in pagan thought was really amazing. "Everything which antiquity regarded as holy in Dionysus or Isis or Herakles or Mithras went into the picture of Christ, and it was always a picture of Christ, not a composite figure, which resulted. Ordinary people could find their old familiar deities in Christ, but it was Christ alone whom they worshipped. . . . Christian monotheism was not inflexible. The veneration of saints enabled it to adopt any older deity who was willing to be adopted.[4]

There were risks, of course: the risk of intellectualizing away the historic basis of the Christian faith, the risk of compromising monotheism, the risk of transferring the main interest from ethics to metaphysics or mythology. One of Schneider's more debateable judgments is his suggestion that the great theological disputes of the third, fourth and fifth centuries were not in the main concerned with essential Christian data, but with ideas assimilated from the surrounding Greek world. This is calculated to set historians of dogma by the ears, and Schneider would be well

[4]Vol. II, 279-289.

content with that, for one of his contentions is that theology has tended to isolate the Church and its history too much, and to disregard the influence of its secular environment. But Christianity is not a hothouse plant!

The general conclusions Schneider reaches at the end of his long story are as follows. Christianity triumphed because its intransigent dogma was wedded to an equally intransigent ethic. Its doctrine of Love was not a theory only; it was meaningless if not related to practice. This was something new to the ancient world.

Take another basic concept of Christianity, that of the Kingdom of God. The Church attempted to realize to some extent the Kingdom on earth, and this meant that, however variously it was interpreted, the world was being offered a new and all-inclusive goal for political and social life. God, not man, was to be the measure of all things. This at once bestowed a new consecration and dignity on the whole of life.

Schneider stresses also a quickening of conscience, not least in sexual matters. It appeared too in the vigorous criticism of the old religions. That had been frequent enough in the philosophers, but without real demand for reform, and the old practices went on. Christianity defied rather than criticized in this sphere. It was not content simply to shrug the shoulders. What was not capable of being revived should be swept away. Christianity brought new life, new confidence, hope. "The new Christian sense of being alive (Lebensgefühl), even though it was often secularized, gave the ancient world unconquerable strength."[5] The one point in which Christianity compares unfavourably with the Greek world was its lack of humour. There was no Christian Aristophanes. Christianity was too puritan! There are laughable episodes in the stories of the saints, but they were not so intended.

Their conception of the Kingdom of God and its relation to earthly kingdoms forced Christians to work out a Christian attitude to politics. The Donatists might say "What have Christians to do with kings, or bishops with a palace?" but that was not the general attitude. Schneider expounds in masterly fashion the two main conceptions, those of Rome and Byzantium, in which a definite Christian political outlook is subservient to, in fact controlled by theology. It strikes a modern person as almost unbelievable that the Church could ever have had such influence in politics. The present-day claims of the Vatican are a hole-and-corner business by comparison. Schneider also points out that many peoples had a national consciousness developed through their acceptance of Christianity, and it was the strength of these new nationalisms which prevented the development of a world-church as a political

[5]Volume II, 314.

reality and not as a mere idea. Christianity certainly gave earnest thought to the fundamental question of the meaning and value of politics. It is true that many Christians turned away from politics, but the majority saw that it was not as simple as that.

In the economic sphere there was no distinctive Christian contribution, apart from the effects of the concept of Love. There was no attempt to alter the economic system. "Christians managed the slave-economy humanely, but slave-economy remained. More and more public land passed over to the Church. The Roman Church gradually became the richest landowner of late antiquity and thought no more of economic reforms. The mode of living of rich Christians was very little different from that of others."[6]

Naturally enough in a work of such wide range, not all the judgments expressed will command agreement. In our view Schneider is open to criticism on two main grounds: his interpretation of the New Testament and his attitude to Judaism. We agree wholeheartedly that Christianity could not have become a world-religion—possibly would not have survived at all—if it had not submitted to Hellenization. From the opening chapters of *Acts* we learn that there was a real danger of it remaining as a sect within Judaism. The "acute Hellenizing of Christianity" (Harnack's famous phrase with reference to the Gnostic deviations of the second century) was not a matter for regret, but rather an essential for survival and for creative impact on Hellenistic civilization. But its basic ideas were derived from Judaism, and the fateful question was whether these would be preserved and really interpreted in the Hellenizing process, or overlaid with Hellenistic ideas and ultimately forgotten. There was a Hebraic heritage in the central thought of God as Redeemer. It was essentially different from Greek conceptions of deity, and therefore needed careful transplanting and re-interpretation. The transplanting had to be risked because the Judaism of Christ's day would have stifled the new growth started by the advent of Christ. We feel, however, that Schneider is insensitive to this Hebraic root of the Christian faith. We agree that only Greek sun and air could make it bloom, but we must insist that the thesis of this great book ought to include a more positive evaluation of the Hebrew religion which produced that root. Even the anti-Jewish Gospel according to St. John affirms that "salvation originates with the Jews" (Jn. iv, 22).

Granted that there had to be a launching out into the deep from the Jewish harbour; but the merchandise carried for the benefit of nations afar was shipped in that harbour, as the home-produce of the Jewish hinterland, not as goods imported there! Schneider minimizes this indebtedness of Christianity to Judaism and ignores

[6]Vol. II, 328f.

eschatology, like many liberal scholars of a few decades ago. He even argues that the original creative work of Jesus, and not only the interpretations of Paul and John, was already partly Hellenized. That Jesus had contacts with Hellenistic life through his upbringing in Galilee will be allowed; it is quite another thing to assume that his basic teaching was influenced by Hellenism. The real Hellenizing was due to St. Paul. It was he who brought the Gospel out into the Greek world and expressed it in Greek terminology. This was a risk that had to be taken. The Gospel must constantly be re-interpreted. But the general inference which is pertinent for our own time is that, provided the Gospel itself is clearly in mind, much freedom is justifiable in attempts to restate it, both as regards language and as regards traditional custom and usage. The truth of the Bible is independent of the original words, and the form of the Church independent of the Church's historic forms.

This study of the creative period of Christianity is not just history—and therefore, in the judgment of some who are prominent in an age of technics, 'bunk.' The past rightly understood is no mere past, as Eucken taught. All this is relevant to our changing situation. As we witness a civilization passing away and wonder how another is to be born we may well tremble at the prospect of what is emerging unless we can believe Christianity has a contribution to make in the sphere of basic ideas and assumptions. It is a question, not of the truth of Christianity, but of the worthwhileness or otherwise of human civilization without Christian elements in it. Dr. Schneider's two volumes stimulate fruitful reflection on these themes. Considering the erudition that is behind them they are remarkably readable and lucid, and there is a real feast for those who can read them. We must hope for an early translation of this great study, for the issues are both large and relevant for those who hold that if the atomic age is to be anything more than a new dark age a Christian *Weltanschauung* must be offered to it. The 19th century tried to retain the Christian ethic while saying goodbye to Christianity as religion. The 20th century has replaced reverent agnosticism by barbaric atheism, and it is now clear that the Christian ethic can only be maintained in its proper context of faith. "The outward fashion of this world" may again be passing away. But if in the divine providence this world is permitted to continue in a new "fashion," is there no prospect of essential Christian values being newly apprehended so as to become its underlying "form"?

THE WRITER WITHOUT A BOOK

By Sydney H. Moore, M.A.

Just two hundred years ago, in the month of May, there was born in France a man unique in world literature—an author who never wrote a book. Yet a bibliography of the books written about him, given in a recently published volume of his correspondence, contains between sixty and seventy items and is by no means exhaustive. For Joseph Joubert's whole life was spent in writing. 'He was at it', says one of his biographers, 'night and day; in bed or out of it, in his study or upon his walks, on foot or inside a diligence, he had ever with him his little gold pencil, his tiny note-book'.[1] He would seem to have been the first of those many nineteenth century French writers who believed in the virtue of a small note-book of *tout petits faits significatifs, amplement circonstanciés et minutieusement notés* as the basis for their criticisms of life. But Taine worked up his note-books into the *Origins of Modern France* and Zola expanded his into the Rougon-Macquart series. Joubert never got so far; his endless diaries and commonplace books and letters are almost the sole memorials we possess of his patient, pain-racked, thoughtful life.

He was born in one of the most beautiful regions of his country, at Montignac, in that lovely Dordogne land between Périgueux and Brive, within range of Uzerche and Rocamadour and Bertrand de Born's Hautefort. Montignac was then only a small town of 3,500 inhabitants, divided into two villages by the foaming Vézère (there was not even a bridge across it in Joubert's boyhood) and when the lad desired to muse and meditate, as was his custom from very early years, and to escape from the racket of a family of no less than fifteen, he could in a few minutes clamber up one of those volcanic *causses*, which none can forget who has ever lived among them. From that elevation range upon range of hills would stretch out before him, in places purple with thyme or heather, but often quite bare limestone scars, where nothing would disturb him save the passing of a herd with his goats or the croak of a soaring raven. At fourteen he left home for the well-known Esquille College in Toulouse, but he had already formed the life-long habit of 'listening'; "at the sight of beauty", he says, "the soul naturally sings over and over to itself everything that is beautiful, that seems to it to be fair." Even at Toulouse, where he acquired a very sound education, he had plenty of time for reverie, for work began at

1 I. G. Duranton: *Joubert le Penseur*, 1869.

4 a.m. and he was always able to finish his tasks before the other students. When he returned to Montignac eight years later, he could not settle on theology or law or medicine as a career. After two years' happy dreaming, free from monkish bias and prejudiced judgments, amid his own Périgourdin hills, he set off to see what life was like in a place where great men dwelt. He arrived in Paris just after his twenty-fourth birthday.

Thanks to letters from his father, a doctor, Joubert soon found himself among friends; in their number were Diderot, with his insistence on the paramount importance of clarity in writing, Marmontel, who had been on the staff at the Esquille at Toulouse, and La Harpe, that inveterate wrangler. Yet it was none of these who was destined to influence the whole of his life. In the home of one of his father's friends he met a youth of twenty-one, Louis de Fontanes, who after many false starts had come, like Joubert, to Paris to seek his fortune as a man of letters. They suited each other exactly, and though Joubert was tall and thin and neat and Fontanes short and plump and untidy, the one looking like an unfrocked priest and the other like a man about town, it was a true instinct which linked them in close friendship for over forty years. Much later Chateaubriand coined the just paradox: "Joubert was an egoist, whose only interest in life was other people." In no small measure his friendship with Fontanes transformed Joubert's egoism into an altruism able to put up with all the younger man's debts, vagaries and love affairs. When Fontanes had gained a position of power under Bonaparte, it was his esteem for Joubert which ensured the appointment of the latter on the staff of the new Imperial University and called forth those letters and memoranda which form one of the most consecutive pieces of literature Joubert ever produced.[2]

There was another aspect of the friendship which greatly benefited the older man. Joubert's health had never been robust and although he lived 45 years after his arrival in Paris, there were very few days of it when he could not rightly have used Pope's word: "that long disease, my life." More and more his aura was that of the sick-room, the chaise-longue, the fireside. For days on end he would lie, unable to get about or even to read, but all the time capable of prolonged meditation and intense thought. From 1786 onwards his home was generally in the little town of Villeneuve sur Yonne, near Sens, and there Fontanes would bring his problems, his schemes, and sometimes his whole family. His visits were a tonic to the invalid and when the circle was completed by the presence of Chateaubriand, Chênedollé and Molé, the clouds would break and Joubert's terse clear thinking plunge the whole

[2]Cf. Tessonneau, *Joseph Joubert, Educateur*, 1944.

group in amazement. A letter written about this time to his sweetheart from Villeneuve shows his style of thought. "Life says to us: You call me unbearable. The truth is, you don't know how to use me. . . . You say I am bitter. . . . I am like an orange and refresh with sweet and reviving juice those who seek my true substance and my very flesh. You only bite at my bitter skin; and if a friendly hand tries to peel this away from my sweet inside and to offer me to you in reality, you push it away with disdain."

As we read the story of the terrible years 1789-1794, we are astonished that any Frenchman could then lead so quiet and ordered a life as did Joubert. It is true he was away from the storm centre for two years. A new office, that of *juge de paix,* was created by the revolutionaries, and to his surprise and pleasure Joubert was chosen as their judge by his old fellow-townsmen in Montignac in November 1790. He was then elected a *notable* and sat on the town council judging disputes, levying taxes, issuing writs and warrants. His latest biographer[3] astutely remarks: "The only pity was that he had something to do in Montignac beside thinking and remembering." On the whole his stay in Périgord was happy and was good for him. He was patient and honest, understood the people, found food for reflection on human nature as he settled their many disputes (for they were then as now a 'disputatious race') and still found plenty of time to read Plato. In 1793 however the Convention changed the system of *juges de paix* for *tribunaux de correction* and, feeling he had done his 'bit' for his country, he resigned and in January left for Paris where the trial of the King had just started. The verdict and the execution of Louis XVI disgusted him with politics for ever—that world at any rate had no place for him.

So to Villeneuve once more, where he lived, as he put it, *Platone platonior,* more platonically than Plato. Platonically that is, until the hideous days of the Terror, when he married Victoire Moreau de Bussy and at length learnt the joy of sharing a home of his own with "one dear to me by many titles." Their house became a place of refuge for his friends. Quiet Villeneuve was all but isolated from the seething tide of revolution and, notwithstanding its comparative nearness to the capital, none of its 4,000 inhabitants suffered death or imprisonment. He could now read and dream in comfort; in his constant illnesses he had a loyal and understanding nurse who not only looked after his frail body but, also, a more difficult task, kept a door firmly closed against chance visitors, who exhausted his small reserves of strength in seeking to explore a mind of such extraordinary richness. "I love," he tells a correspondent, "blank paper more than ever and I no longer wish

[3]Joan Evans, *The Unselfish Egoist,* London, 1947.

to give myself the trouble of expressing carefully any thoughts save those worthy of being written upon silk or bronze. I am stingy with my ink, but I will talk as much as you like." Yet even this was over-statement, for often he lay prostrate for weeks together, unable to climb up the low hills, whence he so loved to contemplate the graceful valley of the Yonne. He had to be content with what he once called "the most beautiful of all forms of courage, the courage to be happy."

We have no space to follow in detail the remaining years of this *épicurien angélique,* as Jules Lemaître calls him in his sonnet. It was near the end of the century that we find something of a spiritual conversion taking place in his mind and life. He became conscious of the necessity to himself of the Christian religion. One could not be said to possess a religion, he maintained, unless it were shared by others. "He only can persuade mankind, who believes that God has spoken to him." As to *which* religion, he held with him of La Mancha that "many and various are the ways by which God bringeth His own to His Kingdom"; the celestial stairway might be of marble or of rough-hewn logs, provided it could be mounted and that the climber find peace at the top. His New Year resolution for 1800 suggests some traits of the man: "Not to be occupied with oneself, but with one's duty; to go on to the end without bowing to the audience; to play one's part and no other role; only to consider. . . the pleasure of the people, if that pleasure be for their good, but to take no heed of their coldness or their smiles; . . . to be anxious not at all about what people think; . . . to be a man and not a coxcomb."

Early in the new century two contacts were of particular importance to him. The first was with Napoleon; *c'est un inter-roi admirable,* he writes. "He has caused the enthusiasm which was lost, lethargic and destroyed, to be born again. May he keep all his successes and grow more and more worthy of them. . . . We had great need of him." The other was his intimate relations with the great new stylist of *Atala* and *René.* The Breton writer summed him up as "a Plato with the heart of a La Fontaine." Joubert suffered much at his hands with admirable self-restraint, though he once went so far as to say: "We want a Chateaubriand with more sense." Still, knowledge of the man whose prose all Europe admired only confirmed Joubert's desire that anything he himself wrote should be characterized by even greater clarity and brevity. We have all read the passage, first made common amongst us by Matthew Arnold's essay: "If there be a man upon earth tormented by the cursed desire to get a whole book into a page, a whole page into a phrase and this phrase into a word—that man is myself." He might well smile at the neologism coined by him to excuse his

neglect of correspondence, 'hydromelanophobia,' hatred of ink, for he believed that most men of letters wrote too much—it was maturer thinking they needed. "It is the *thought* that must be polished . . . once it is perfected, its expression will drop from the pen as lucid and shining as a drop of water." Those who would write must seek "that quietude of mind in which alone the soul can grow."

Numerous passages in his journal waft one's thought across the Vosges to the *Perfektibilitätstheorie* of his great German contemporary. "Perfection and I are congenial, for she exacts as much slowness as vivacity. She lets me begin all over again and makes pauses necessary. I would like, I tell you, to be perfect." But a price had to be paid and it was Brother Body who paid it. *Quand je luis, je me consomme,* when I do shine, I burn myself up. Well might a friend say of him: "He looked like a soul which had found a body by chance and was trying to make the best of it."

In his *Portraits Littéraires* Sainte Beuve makes out the list of French *pensée-istes*: Pascal, La Bruyère, La Rochefoucauld, Vauvenargues, perhaps Montaigne, but certainly Joubert, and goes on to say that the last-named had both the manner and the matter of the first-class maker of *pensées*; "he paints life in a picture and summarizes it in an aphorism." Today these maxims are the delight of aspirants after wisdom. A short selection may serve to conclude this inadequate sketch of their author. As we read them, we see not the egoist Joubert is often supposed to be, but a man like the Cervantes he so much admired—far-seeing, dignified, gracious, looking on life with the kindly eyes of one who knows its folly and its laughter as well as its sorrows and cares.

"We must keep a corner of our minds free to lodge the ideas of our friends. It is unbearable to have to deal with men whose brains are stuffed full to overflowing. Let us ever have a guest-welcoming spirit."

"To see a man who is kind gives me as much pleasure as being kind myself."

"One cannot even be just to one's neighbour, unless one loves him."

"I am fulfilling in every case to the best of my ability the obligation of being happy."

"One can neither speak against Christianity without wrath, nor for it without love."

"The thought of God is a light which guides and brings comfort; its oil is prayer."

"Life's evening ever brings with it its own lamp."

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea: a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY
AND RELEVANT STUDIES

The Meaning of the Creative Act. By NICOLAS BERDYAEV. 344 pp. Gollancz. 18s.

Berdyaev wrote this seminal book on the eve of the first World War, when he was 40. A German translation was published in 1927 but this is its first appearance in English. Those who know his thought from later works will be interested to study this first outpouring. Those who wish to make a first direct acquaintance with his mind cannot do better than master this book. It bears the marks of the Slav style of mystical philosophy, a style which he says is "primarily apocalyptic, bound up with the times and seasons of universal history, with concrete incarnation and with eschatology." It is assertive and repetitive, a mode of communication which is designed to produce *sorbonost*—an "ecumenicity of consciousness" which is "knowing love." It presents a vision of a fallen cosmos, controlled by law but redeemed by the Second Adam, which has come to the brink of "the age of creativeness" where the "creative mystery of man" shall be revealed, as it has not been in the epoch of law or in the epoch of redemption. This is Joachim of Fiore brought up to date, with assistance from Jakob Boehme and Angelus Silesius. The thesis is applied to every sphere of human experience and concern. The lineaments of freedom, creativity and love are hinted by a powerful critique of what passes for true humanism in an anthropology which is confined to the fulfilment of law and the accomplishing of redemption. Such "humanism" yields only the *ennui* of adaptation to necessity and obedience to the results of sin. The book is not really about the doctrine of creation so much as about the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is one of the great books of our time, for though a major theological criticism would leave practically nothing in it unmodified, the critic himself will emerge with his own thought shaken out of pedestrianism at every point.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

Kant's First Critique. An Appraisal of the permanent significance of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. By H. W. CASSIRER. 367 pp. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

Why is such a new study of the Critique of Pure Reason required? The answer given is, because of the present dominance of Logical Positivism. The intention of the book is to take account of this prevalent philosophy and see what bearing Kant's Critique has upon it.

The beginning is made with the Aesthetic, where it is admitted to Logical Positivism against the view of Kant that space and time are not *a priori*

intuitions. Then we hasten on to the Analytic, where Kant is held to have right on his side over against Logical Positivism, when he maintains that scientific knowledge cannot be constructed except by the use of *a priori* ideas, especially those of substance and cause. But Cassirer says that though these ideas are *a priori*, in that they are independent of sensation, yet they do not belong to the nature of human reason by necessity. His departure from Kant at this point amounts to saying that the ideas of substance and cause are tools that reason has created for the construction of knowledge.

It is clear that the treatment both of the Aesthetic and the Analytic is dependent on the change from the Newtonian physics on which Kant relied, to the modern physics which differs from Newton, not only as regards space and time, but also with respect to substance and cause.

We proceed to the Dialectic, where there is little controversy with Logical Positivism.

(1) Kant is right when he argues that the "I think" which is the logical subject of all judgments, gives no real knowledge of the self, which can only be known empirically.

(2) The Antinomies simply show that the knowledge of the world as a whole is always beyond us, though we cannot help striving after it.

(3) The criticisms of the proofs for the existence of God are sound. Kant's moral theology in the Second Critique is simply a postulate of conduct which does not amount to objective knowledge.

As to the Methodology, Kant rightly maintains that it is impossible to recognize purpose as constitutive of phenomena, though we cannot systematize knowledge without the idea of it as guide.

In all this, what Cassirer admires in Kant is the anti-metaphysical tendency which he shares with Logical Positivism. He utterly repudiates Kant's residual metaphysic of the "thing-in-itself" as the ground of phenomena.

To sum up, it is only in the region of the Analytic that Kant appears to be allowed an advantage over Logical Positivism, though this advantage here is real and important.

The book is a very thorough piece of work, deserving close study. But as to its anti-metaphysical tendency, I will content myself with referring to Emile Meyerson, who has said that man makes metaphysic as naturally as he breathes. I think, indeed, that the complete exclusion of metaphysic from the mind means the suffocation of reason. ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society. G. ERNEST WRIGHT. 176 pp. S.C.M. 7s.

Let it be said at once that this is excellent value for money. Here are almost 170 pages of solid meat, which would well serve any minister who wanted to look at the biblical material relevant to one of the most pressing of all our modern problems. This second volume of the *Ecumenical Biblical Studies* (the previous one being *The Biblical Doctrine of Work*) was written by Professor Wright after he had discussed the biblical material with a study group which met over a period of two years in Chicago; yet this volume bears all the marks of being composed in one style by one person; and although at places it is rather heavily "ecumenese," it has none of the compressed "hodge-podge" which sometimes mars team-work. Strictly speaking, of course, there is, as Dr. Cave used to point out, no *doctrine* of man; and while Professor Wright does not use Dr. Cave's word 'estimate', it is clear from the beginning that he does not claim that the Bible presents us with a systematic teaching or dogma about man. Throughout this book, therefore, the word "doctrine" is understood to mean, on the one hand,

the Bible's testimony to what God has done and, on the other hand, the inferences which the biblical writers have made from the testimony and those which we may believe ought to be made in the light of our own historical situation. There are four main sections into which the work is divided, each of which is sub-divided in turn: Individual and Community in the Bible; Man and his Societies in the World; the New Man and the New Society; and the People of God in the World. The treatment of the subjects and the handling of the relevant biblical material are alike admirable; one's clear impression is that the Bible is allowed to speak for itself, there being no attempt to force its message into some preconceived mould; and the documentation is copious.

Each reader will find points on which he considers the book especially illuminating. The present reviewer will content himself with recording two. First, in the treatment of the nature of the New Society, there is an interesting study of the related ideas of peoplehood and community in their relation to organization and institutions, which leads to the point that in the biblical material these latter are only sanctioned as they serve the purposes of God for the former: "institutionalism and the pious feelings connected with it received no permanent 'Yea' from the heavenly throne" (p. 85). It would be profitable to work out the logical implications of this for Christian unity. Second, the emphasis in the section dealing with the People of God's responsibility for the world on the fact that it is responsibility to its Lord *before* the world rather than an active responsibility for the salvation of the world (p. 129). Salvation is in the hands of God, who offers it to the world in Christ. To this fact the Church bears witness while it lives loyally to its covenant with God. Whether we agree that no more than this is expected of the community (p. 129), we should perhaps be more ready than we sometimes are to realize that there is strong New Testament evidence for the belief that when the life of the Christian community comes near to its Lord's intention something is *thereby* proclaimed to the world, which no word can so adequately speak.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Pattern of Christian Truth. By H. E. W. TURNER. 508 pp. Mowbray. 42s.

This is a very important book, though necessarily a difficult one. It deals with the relationships between orthodoxy and heresy, primarily in the early Church, but with inevitable implications beyond that period. Prof. Turner, who occupies the Lightfoot Chair of Divinity at Durham, has already well established himself as a scholar of acute and independent judgment; but he is a convinced Anglican, admitting (on p. ix) that he has "endeavoured to maintain the customary approach of Anglican scholarship". That admission is not only frank but wise, for it forestalls criticism based on the question as to when the quest for knowledge passes from formulating judgments to defending them. It is therefore necessary to assess this work in two ways: as a work of historical theology, and as an expression of judgment. The author himself recognizes this, saying in the preface, "Whatever originality it may claim to possess resides not in the facts which it records but in the interpretation which has been placed upon them".

As to the facts, they are most competently marshalled. That is not to say the plan of the book is simple. There are of necessity so many interweaving threads that a simple pattern is not possible. The first three chapters discuss theories of the origin of heresy, and analyze historically and theologically the relations between it and orthodoxy; the next four chapters compare and contrast the difference in use made by orthodoxy and

heresy of their necessarily common bases: scripture, tradition, and reason. The final chapter summarizes the author's conclusions. The treatment is thorough, all needful references are cited, and one has every confidence in his sure mastery of the early centuries. Obiter dicta and incisive comments sprinkled throughout the work help to enhance its value.

As to the judgments, they accord with a convinced holding of as much of the ancient orthodoxy as separation from Rome permits. It is easy to hold to Roman orthodoxy simply on authority; but the acceptance and definition of any type of non-Roman orthodoxy is beset with difficulties, for its delimitations are dependent on a complex of reasons not easily objectively stated. There is also involved the making of a judgment, again not wholly objective, as to the point in time up till which traditional orthodoxy is normative and as to the precise area of the realm in which its writ runs. In the present work that latter point is interestingly illustrated by the remarkable absence of the word "schism". It does not occur even once in the index, whereas "heresy" has more than a score of mentions. It may fairly be argued that the book is about orthodoxy, whose denial is heresy, not about obedience to the Roman Pontiff as head of the undivided Catholic Church, where refusal is schism; there is nevertheless a logical relationship which is not dismissed by silence. But these are problems confronting all who wish to stand for the essentials of orthodoxy.

The quality of the work may be indicated by a few citations, some for concurrence, some not quite acceptable to the average Free Churchman. We may note with gratification that Prof. Turner approaches the question of Reunion realistically: "Unity in Diversity is neither as unprimitive nor as uncatholic as it has been sometimes fashionable to suppose" (p. x). Some of us might not be so ready to endorse the opinion, expressed on the same page, that orthodoxy owes little to heresy. It may be argued that orthodoxy became progressively defined as it came into conflict with variants, and that the rejected heresies often left at least some mark on subsequent orthodoxy. But Prof. Turner, probably by the logic of his main thesis, seems to regard orthodoxy as something ideally fixed, which unfolds rather than develops. This may be a useful concept, but it leads to curious statements like this: "Christians lived Trinitarianly before the doctrine of the Trinity began to be thought out conceptually" (p. 474). But in other places he seems to suggest that orthodoxy is to be considered as implicit in the data rather than explicit in the current formulation, and we would commend what he says on p. 475: "We are not yet within sight of any intellectual formulation adequate to the rich and many-sided character of the experience of the Church." He may have a valuable pointer for future mutual enrichment by the linking of the further explication of orthodoxy with and through the trend towards reunion, "the working out by the whole Church of the implications of her common subject-matter" (p. 477). Prof. Turner has a fine Christian optimism, and he sees no irreconcilability between essential orthodoxy and ecumenical hopes. It is as true of himself as of the argument from Tradition, that the nerve is "a vote of confidence in Christian history".

This is not an easy book, and its main theses may not be altogether agreeable to average Free Churchmen. But it is a monument of sound scholarship, and those who differ from his judgments might be hard put to it to make a better case for their own. A. R. Vine.

Ultimate Questions. By Nathaniel Micklem. 127 pp. Bles. 7s. 6d.

This book contains the Cole Lectures, delivered recently at Vanderbilt University, Tennessee. Dr. Micklem has in mind the many serious and not irreligious minds which are alienated from the Christian faith; and he would

fain make an appeal to them to consider afresh "whether in the light of history we may not regard the great symbols of the Christian tradition as pointing to those last secrets which may only be apprehended, and that imperfectly, by faith" (p. 6). So this is an essay in apologetics; and the author's fear that the proponents of varying forms of orthodoxy will from time to time be shocked by what he has written is likely to be fully justified, for this is a book which simply will not fit into any theological school. Many will regard this as one of its great merits; and they will cordially approve Dr. Micklem's "ganging his ain gait", learning from whomsoever he will.

Five themes are dealt with: the Language of Religion, Creation and Providence, the Jesus of History, the Resurrection, and the Cosmic Christ. It is impossible within the space of a brief review to do anything like justice to the argument of these lectures or to take up any of the manifold points of fascinating interest; but if one is asked whether the author succeeds in his apologetic task, the answer is yes, provided that by success in this field is meant very competent expression of truth allied with a really sympathetic understanding of those addressed, a readiness to give the unbeliever's difficulties full weight, a reluctance to press the Christian evidence too far, a refusal to see the apologist's task as that of a religious know-all, and a constant sense of wonder at all that eludes even the eye of faith. No serious mind, however unbelieving, could fail to recognize the depth as well as the charm of this book; and none to whom the apologetic task is committed in these desperate days could fail to learn much from the content of his message and the technique of its presentation. JOHN HUXTABLE.

Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation. By W. SCHWARZ. 225 pp. Cambridge University Press. 25s.

This is a great time of Bible Translation, soon, we hope, to be crowned with the new English Version upon which so many scholars are now engaged. It has naturally been a time also of wrestling with the problems and principles of translating. Dr. Schwarz, who offers this very scholarly and thoroughly documented yet eminently readable study, is lecturer in German at University College, London, and has already contributed some of the products of his special research to learned periodicals. His theme is the clash between two principles of translation which he calls the "philological" and the "inspirational". The former is represented by Jerome, the latter by Augustine. Dr. Schwarz begins with their clash in the fifth century. The grip of the Vulgate and the Scholastic four-fold exegesis and the method of explaining the Bible in the Middle Ages are clearly set out, then comes a long and most careful study of the sixteenth century clash: Reuchlin and Erasmus representing the philological, and Luther the inspirational view. No student of the Reformation ought to neglect what Dr. Schwarz says about the Humanists and Reformers in their effort to study Greek and Hebrew and penetrate to the true text. No one at all interested in the meaning of the Word of God can fail to profit by this searching examination of the perennial clash between those who want a word-for-word translation, those who want tradition, authority and present inspiration to rule, and those whose aim (to quote Dr. C. H. Dodd in the Foreword) is to let "the subject-matter overrule the words, so that the rendering represents the meaning of the original as the translator understands it and as he would himself express it in addressing his own contemporaries and countrymen."

W. GORDON ROBINSON.

God and Man in the Old Testament. By LEON ROTH. 168 pp. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This is one of a series of Ethical and Religious Classics of East and

West. It is an anthology of passages from the Old Testament grouped under headings and allowed to speak for themselves with a minimum of introductory comment. Not all would accept without question the view of the General Editors that Christian and non-Christian religions all teach three stages in man's approach to God: "an ethical stage, then one of knowledge and love, leading to the mystical union of the soul with God." But in this volume Dr. Roth has selected well. E. C. BLACKMAN.

The Key Concepts of the Old Testament. By ALBERT GELIN. 94 pp. Sheed and Ward. 6s.

The Gospel of Victory. By M. A. C. WARREN. 126 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

Père Gelin's book is a translation of *Les Idées Maîtresses de l'Ancien Testament;* the book has its *imprimatur,* but the name of the translator is not given though he has done his work well. It is a modest, useful, and moderately conservative short introduction to the developing history, the great personalities and the central themes of the Old Testament, grouped into three sections which deal with the revelation of God, with God's plans for mankind and with personal salvation. Much of this is most helpful and given in brief compass. Unfortunately, the usefulness of the book is marred by several faults. References in the footnotes are neither recent enough nor wide enough; the forms in which many proper names are given are confusing to the Protestant reader, as is also the numbering of Psalms according to the LXX and the use of four Books of Kings and of "Paralipomena" for Chronicles; and there are some faulty transliterations and misprints (e.g. different spellings for the Maccabees).

Dr. Warren's book, based on the Epistle to the Galatians and concentrating chiefly on four of its great texts, explores the missionary implications of the Letter for the contemporary activity of the Church. As is to be expected from Dr. Warren, there is a firm grasp of modern missionary endeavour well illustrated by examples from various fields overseas. He begins, most interestingly, by showing the great importance of the figure of Abraham for Paul and he brings out clearly the way in which Paul shows how human divisions can be transcended, tensions eased, responsibilities accepted and "the marks of Jesus" displayed in the corporate life of the Church. Altogether it is a good example of modern exegesis.

W. GORDON ROBINSON.

Jesus and the Kingdom of God. By HAROLD ROBERTS. 124 pp. Epworth. 12s. 6d.

The aim of this book is to consider "the theological implications of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels about the Kingdom of God". We have two initial chapters which trace the treatment of the Kingdom of God in recent scholarship and outline Jesus' teaching with its Old Testament presuppositions. Dr. Roberts is then ready for his more general exposition, which shows how the original conception is reproduced in more modern and systematic theology. He does this under the headings of The Doctrine of God, the Person of Christ, the Church, the Christian Hope. This was a great thing to attempt, though we feel that Dr. Roberts is not equally successful in all these sections. Some of the material seems irrelevant to the dynamism of the Biblical idea; e.g. references to the views of Thomasius, Tillich and W. R. Matthews in the Christological chapter. What is needed is not so much indications of how much or how little the theologians have conserved of the Gospel testimony about Jesus and the Kingdom as a real working out of all that is implied in the conception of Jesus as inaugurator of God's sovereign rule among men. Dr. Roberts is firm in

asserting that the consummation of the Kingdom does not mean the end of history or of space-time experience, and one can only regret that he has not allowed himself space and time to substantiate that argument. But these criticisms must not detract from our appreciation of a competent work, and of its author's manifest ability to be both judicious and declaratory.

E. C. BLACKMAN.

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith. By G. W. H. LAMPE, editor. 95 pp. Mowbrays. 7s. 6d.

This book consists of five papers read at a conference on the subject of Justification and the Sacraments by representatives of the Community of the Resurrection and the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature. The discussion of this theme thus brought together divergent schools of Anglican thought in an attempt to find the extent of the common ground between them and to clarify the differences still outstanding. That differences remain is evidenced by the papers themselves, but a full account of the discussion would have added to the usefulness of the book. The theme of the conference is of transcendent importance. Paul Tillich has told us that the doctrine of Justification is so strange to contemporary man that it is almost impossible to make it intelligible to him. If this is so, it gives us a clear indication of the magnitude of the task confronting us; for Justification lies very near to the heart of the Gospel we have to preach. Canon Dillistone's essay in this book is an interesting and not unsuccessful attempt to show the contemporary relevance of the doctrine. But before we can preach Justification with force and conviction we must be clear about its meaning. Not only our evangelistic task but the ecumenical enterprise itself demands this. Even the book before us does not succeed in making it clear that what underlies the more obvious divergencies between Catholic and Protestant conceptions of Justification is a primary cleavage concerning the nature of divine grace. This is *the* question of questions. But this book is undoubtedly to be commended as a valuable contribution to our thinking on the subject of Justification and its relevance to the life and witness of the contemporary Church.

The Decline of Wisdom. By GABRIEL MARCEL. 56 pp. Harvill. 5s.

Readers already familiar with the Christian philosophy of Gabriel Marcel will welcome this little book, whose value is out of all proportion to its size. Others may find it rather hard going at first, by reason of the extreme concentration of the argument, but in any case it is a book to be read more than once. It consists of three essays: The Limitations of Industrial Civilization, The Notion of Spiritual Heritage, and The Breaking up of the Notion of Wisdom. This "diagnosis of our time" is superior to many not only in the depth of its analysis but also in the sanity and strength of its constructive thought. It is rich in germinal ideas, and preachers who work through it will glean much that will profit themselves and their congregations, provided they are prepared to take a bit of trouble in developing what they find.

H. F. LOVELL COCKS.

Social Life of the Early Christians. By J. G. DAVIES. 164 pp. Lutterworth. 17s. 6d.

This is intended as a companion to an earlier volume on the daily life of a Christian in the formative centuries of the Church. The two together make an excellent supplement to the ordinary text-books of Church History. The author's method is to let the original documents speak for themselves, and we have six chapters dealing with the presentation of Christianity to pagan neighbours, Christian novels (the apocryphal Gospels and Acts), the

University of Athens in the 4th century when Gregory of Nazianzus was a student there, pilgrimage to the Holy Land in 400 A.D., Christian views on the education of children, and "Life on a pillar," an appreciation of the type of asceticism too commonly caricatured in the person of Simeon Stylites. All this has the effect of taking the reader right into the atmosphere of the time. Each chapter has a careful bibliography to stimulate further study.

E. C. Blackman.

St. Thomas Aquinas: Theological Texts. Selected and translated with notes by Thomas Gilby. 423 pp. O.U.P. 15s.

St. Thomas may be more respected on a slightly lower pedestal. Catholic theologians, now encouraged to range a little more widely, will recognize his merits enhanced by comparison; and Protestants, so liable, as Dean Swift pointed out, to rip coat with trimming, may take more from him because they are not obliged to do so. The volume and style of his writings daunt most readers—few have worked right through even the *Summa Theologica*. But he was a very great soul and a very great intellect; and dependence on him makes the Catholic definite if sometimes wrong, while neglect of him makes the Protestant woolly even if often right. His system is seven hundred years old; yet it gives a philosophy which is coherent still and holds fast to those great fundamentals of the Christian faith, established in the first undivided centuries, which the Reformed Church has no warrant for discarding. Nor is it difficult to modify his system to enable account to be taken of the findings of modern knowledge. We need not seek in St. Thomas our final philosophy and theology; but we lose much if we ignore him.

Father Gilby has therefore rendered a great service by compiling this work. He has gathered apposite sections not only from the *Summa Theologica,* but from the Commentaries, Diputations, *Contra Gentes* and other works, and has arranged them in a clear logical order under eleven headings, including Godhead and Trinity, Creation, the Fall, the Incarnation, the Church, and the Last Things. The sections are numbered, 670 of them, and there is good cross-referencing, indexing and annotating. There could be no better introduction to the greatest medieval theologian.

A. R. Vine.

In *Portrait of Calvin* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.)—the author stresses the title as 'differentiating it somewhat from a straight biography. It is a portrait, not a photograph'—the Rev. T. H. L. Parker has achieved what many will regard as a considerable feat, that of presenting in short compass an account of Calvin which is both lively and sympathetic. His study has the additional interest of having been written by someone not of Calvin's tradition, upon whom Calvin's virtues and attractiveness have insensibly stolen. Those who still think of Calvin as gloomy and of his doctrine as inhuman and surrounded with outer darkness will be surprised to find how moving his story is and how full of light, when set forth in Mr. Parker's clear and vigorous language. 'Calvin was born to write', and as 'Man of Letters' he 'must share the honour of being the "father of French prose" with a very different writer, Rabelais'; while 'it would be hard to find his equal as a dogmatic theologian . . . in systematic theology Calvin stands supreme'. But when all is said, 'it is the essential harmony of the man . . . that gives its particular significance to Calvin's life'; and that is why it was abundantly worth while to attempt a portrait of this kind. Mr. Parker shows him as 'not cold . . . not vindictive' but rather 'sensitive, easily wounded, highly strung', with 'a way of making and keeping friends', 'a man who could not live without friendship'. Many will be grateful for this book.

Mr. Pepys and Nonconformity. By A. G. Matthews. 122 pp. Independent Press. 8s. 6d.

This little book consists of five essays, only one of which has appeared in print before. Two on 'Mr. Pepys and Nonconformity' are followed by 'Puritans in Dorothy Osborne's Letters', 'Whartons Good and Bad', the latter a study of the sons of 'The Good Lord Wharton' from the correspondence of their tutors, which is preserved in manuscript in the Bodleian Library; and the volume ends with 'The Puritans At Prayer'. It is perhaps a pity that this last essay is tacked on to the rest; for while all that Mr. Matthews writes has the humour and humanity of his graceful, semi-conversational style, this essay, which is a sort of appendix to his study of 'Puritan Worship' in the Mansfield College symposium on worship, is of a more serious nature than the rest and deserves a more permanent place in the literature on the subject than it is likely to gain from its publication here.

Tillotson: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Literature. By Louis G. Locke. 188 pp. Anglistica, Vol. IV. Rosenkilde and Bagger, Copenhagen. Dan. Kr. 23., Eng. 24s.

Archbishop Tillotson is worth rescuing from oblivion on many counts. Himself the son of a Dissenter, he retained a friendly understanding of Dissent and an interest in 'comprehension'; 'esteemed the best preacher of the age' (Burnet), he made the pulpit 'a powerful agency for weaning men from puritan ideas' (Gordon); his 'moderation', appreciation of reason and openness to charges of heresy and even atheism foreshadow a new century; and when the century dawned, his style was called 'incomparable', even Dr. Johnson hesitating to object to 'what has been applauded by so many suffrages'. Mr. Locke pays special attention to Tillotson's literary reputation, but this is more than a merely literary study. Though relatively slight, it is a careful piece of work and may take its place beside Canon Carpenter's biography of Tillotson's predecessor, Thomas Tenison, and Professor Sykes' keenly anticipated biography of his successor, William Wake.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall.

John Wesley, Preacher. By W. L. Doughty. 214 pp. Epworth. 18s. 6d.

Selections from John Wesley's 'Notes on the New Testament'. By John Lawson. 219 pp. Epworth. 15s.

Wesley was by no means as great a preacher as Whitefield, yet the results of his preaching were more enduring. His written sermons, too, are much more interesting to read than Whitefield's rather verbose utterances, except when Whitefield is tilting at the sins that Hogarth caricatured. Doughty presents us with the first full-length critique of Wesley as a preacher. The task was well worth doing, and it has been worthily accomplished. The author's method is to describe Wesley's mentors (chiefly his father), his congregations (including the hooligans and mobs), and the effects of his sermons. He has an admirable analysis of the chief sermon-topics Wesley had recourse to, and he concludes that the impact of Wesley's preaching must have been much greater than the all-too-elegant printed sermons would indicate. He is particularly interesting on the preacher's preference for the poor, for itinerant preachers, and for early morning sermons. Not less so is Wesley's determination that a sermon should not be longer than fifteen minutes, and a service no more than an hour. It is refreshing to learn that Wesley considered shouting in the pulpit as a slow form of suicide. We are left to conclude that Wesley's impact was due to the meeting of the great spiritual hunger of his time, his simplicity, his psychology, and his preaching of experimental divinity (not speculative

theology). These were all factors in his success, but they do not unravel the mystery of his uniqueness.

Methodist Local Preachers have to read, as required doctrinal standards, Wesley's *Forty-four Sermons* and his *Notes on the New Testament.* The latter have been systematically arranged with explanatory comments by John Lawson, a Methodist minister who is more than competent as a theologian, as his admirable *Conflict in Christology* showed. His work is of some historic interest, but his own comments are of far more pragmatic value than Wesley's *Notes.* It is these that local preachers and Methodist ministers will turn to for their chief illumination, for he can write of complex and abstruse matters such as eschatology with clarity and judgment, as well as in fidelity to the main gist of the Biblical doctrine. It is greatly to be hoped that Mr. Lawson will produce his own constructive volume of Biblical theology.

Evangelical Nonconformists and Higher Criticism in the 19th Century. By Willis B. Glover, Jr. 294 pp. Independent Press. 17s. 6d.

This is a most sober, documented account of the controversies about the historical criticism of the sacred scriptures in which the Nonconformists of the last century were involved. Dr. Willis B. Glover holds that the decline of religion was as much due to the impact of criticism as to the new geology and biology introduced by Lyell and Darwin. Indeed, he maintains that criticism was inevitable and that the study of evolution merely accelerated it. He shows how the critics were first met by an unreasoning conservatism on the part of the older evangelicals, who ineffectively applied the stale apologetics of Paley and Bishop Butler in terms of miracle and prophecy. The distinguishing mark of the English critics (as compared with Strauss and Renan on the Continent) was that they were Christian in intention, not rationalist, and this fact enabled the Churches in England to accept criticism with less antagonism than elsewhere. The positive results of Higher Criticism were that it forced the theologians to take the problem of authority seriously, and it gave to preachers a better alternative than allegorical exegesis for dealing with the contradictions of the Scriptures. Perhaps the author might have stressed other positive gains in the studies. For example, historical criticism indicated different levels of authority for the Christian conscience, and displayed the amazing patience of God and the persistent misunderstanding by men of His Revelation. But the author is right to stress that the newer exponents of Biblical preaching in our own day, who reject so much of the liberal Protestantism of the 'New Theology' at the beginning of the present century but base their theological tenets on the historical approach, are also indebted to the movement of historical criticism. He does not add, as he might, that the hot-gospeller of today is wilfully (in the interest of a spurious loyalty to the Bible) turning a blind eye towards historical criticism. We do well to remember that many of the critics arrived at their conclusions after an agonized search for truth, and they believed that they were led by the Holy Spirit in this quest. This first full-length consideration of its theme deserves to be read by present-day theological students and ministers; and, while its subject is not likely to appeal to the TV-dazzled millions, it is most interestingly presented by a university professor whose lay knowledge of theological issues many a minister might envy. Horton Davies.

Walter Howard Frere: His Correspondence on Liturgical Revision and Construction. Edited by Ronald C. D. Jaspar. Alcuin Club Collections No. XXXIX. 317 pp. S.P.C.K. 35s.

This collection of letters and memoranda written by Dr. Frere between

1906 and 1934 reveals not only his immense learning in liturgical matters but also his profund influence on the work of Prayer Book revision both in this country and abroad. The Editor has supplied just enough information to give each letter its proper setting.

Frere's chief concern in working for a revised Book of Common Prayer was to provide the Church of England with a more adequate Prayer of Consecration in the Service of Holy Communion. Frere himself believed that, as was the universal custom in the early Church, the prayer should include an epiclesis, the prayer as a whole being regarded as effecting the consecration. Anglo-Catholics who followed the Roman tradition held that it was the words of institution that effected the consecration and could not therefore agree to an invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements after those words had been spoken. Frere made the interesting suggestion that in a revised canon both forms should be provided as alternatives. This proposal never won general support and was not, of course, followed in the 1928 book. Frere's proposal, however, indicates the desire he always showed to do full justice to the views of those from whom he differed.

All who want to study the story of the proposed revision of the Prayer Book will find invaluable material here and will be grateful to the publishers and the Editor for this delightfully produced volume.

JAMES M. TODD.

Essentials for a Living Church. JAMES GRAY. 60 pp. Berean Press, Birmingham. 3s. 6d.

This slim volume is by no means as slight as its appearance might suggest; and in it the Principal of Overdale College, Selly Oak, studies the relation between Scripture and Tradition. He divides what he has to say into three main sections: Living Tradition, Tradition and Scripture, Essentials of Apostolic Christianity. He takes his stand against those who claim that they acknowledge only Scripture, arguing that all Christian bodies are more guided by tradition than is often explicitly recognized and that there is great need for all Church leaders to recover a lively and deep awareness of the *richer* meaning of tradition. This he provides by an interesting discussion of *paradosis* and cognate terms; and this finally leads him to formulate two fundamental questions: How is the Church to judge what is legitimate application and amplification of the original Apostolic Tradition as contained in Scripture in matters where no explicit guidance is given? And how are we to separate what is a true embodiment of the essential Gospel from what is merely denominational custom, sectarian conviction or the mere reflection of a cultural epoch? This leads further to a discussion of the authority of the Bible today, the New Testament as the norm by which tradition is to be judged, a point illustrated by reference to doctrine, initiation, and the ministry. There is a final discussion of the difficulty of applying the criterion and of what we may regard as the essentials of the Gospel. It is all very competently done indeed; there is full documentation from a wide range of sources; and this scholarly book may be warmly commended to all concerned with one of the most important theological issues of the day.

Episcopacy Re-asserted. By E. R. FAIRWEATHER. 59 pp. Mowbray. 4s.

This is an essay in controversy, a rejoinder to *The Historic Episcopate*, the work of seven Cambridge Anglicans, which was recently reviewed in this journal. Their aim was to restate the case for episcopacy so as to offer Nonconformists a theological interpretation of it which would not involve a denial of their own past. Part of their argument was that the Anglo-Catholic view of episcopacy as the *esse* of the Church is "unbiblical, unhistorical and unanglican". It was to be expected that this would evoke

some answer; and this has now come from the Associate Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Ethics in Trinity College, Toronto.

In general it seems that it is the adjective "unanglican" which feels most charged with venom; and Dr. Fairweather calls to his aid a powerful posse of Caroline Divines, who are regarded as having said the last word upon the subject. One wonders why, since the usual Anglican appeal is to Scripture and the Primitive Church. In any case, the Caroline Divines seem not to have been entirely unanimous, for the authors of *The Historic Episcopate* also quote them, sometimes the same ones, in a very different sense; and the fact that Dr. Norman Sykes is in agreement with their interpretation considerably shakes one's faith in Dr. Fairweather's reading of the matter.

An attack is also made upon the biblical section of the work of the Cambridge Seven; and Dr. J. A. T. Robinson comes under particularly heavy fire. But here again the shots seem to fall short of the target, particularly when Dr. Fairweather seeks to maintain the virtual identity of Church and Kingdom. He is especially unhappy with Dr. Robinson's eschatological view of the Church and its unity. The truth seems to be that *The Historic Episcopate* took a little further the accumulating evidence that the extreme Anglo-Catholic position cannot be supported either from the Bible or from history; and one's suspicion, it must be admitted, is aroused by the author's fear, expressed on his penultimate page, that should the views of the Cambridge Seven prevail the Church of South India might be admitted to full communion with the Church of England. JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Christian World Mission in our day by K. S. Latourette (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 10s. 6d., 191 pp.) is perhaps the most balanced world survey which Professor Latourette has ever written. He still insists against all pessimists that (p. 7) 'We live in one of the great days of the Church'. But he is willing to recognize in the world of yesterday the importance of the large defections from the Christian faith; and he is willing to admit in the world of today that the recuperative power of Christianity is not as clearly seen in Europe as it is in America. "In the United States", he says, "the situation is in some ways in striking contrast with that of Europe. So different is it, indeed, that it is often difficult for Christians on one side of the Atlantic to understand those on the other side". Because of this more realistic appraisal of the weakness as well as the strength of the present impact of Christianity, this is both a stronger and a more encouraging book than some of Professor Latourette's earlier works. And it continues the author's illuminating habit of surveying the total Christian picture—Roman Catholic, Orthodox and Protestant.

In the perspective set by Dr. Latourette we can fittingly read the documents on the main theme of the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, *Christ the Hope of the World* (World Council of Churches, 1s. 6d., 48 pp.). This is an important stimulus to theological discussion, even if the differences among the theologians are not fully resolved. The comments by the Assembly itself are important, though it is a pity that comment by the Orthodox members, which is to be printed in the Official Report, is not also given here.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, whose death in 1944 was a great loss to the Ecumenical Movement, has something of a vogue at the present time. *Temptation* (S.C.M., 3s., 47 pp.) is a series of addresses given to the German Confessing Church in 1937. They are admirably translated, but the idiom in which they are written is not a natural one in English. In spite of many acute perceptions, the way in which the Bible is used will be a barrier to many readers.

The Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, Sidney Spencer, has published a volume of essays in Liberal Religion entitled *The Deep Things of God* (Allen and Unwin, 8s. 6d., 118 pp.). This is a pleasant volume, though hardly adequate to its title. The author expounds a Christianity freed from dogmatic restrictions, and to use his own words, 'so rendered capable of meeting effectively the problems and difficulties of our time, and liberating the power of the Spirit for the transformation of human life'. Yet it is quite clear from these essays themselves that the freeing of Christianity from dogmatic restrictions fails to produce the utterly desirable result which the author envisages. H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Science and its Background. By H. D. ANTHONY. 337 pp. Macmillan. 20s.

Christianity and Science. By CHARLES E. RAVEN. 103 pp. Lutterworth. 2s.

Dr. Anthony's "very readable and informative book" (to quote this journal's review of the first edition) presents the story of science as part of the general process of the development of civilization. It is a book for the upper forms of grammar schools and is written with professional skill. It deals in turn with: The Rivers Period; The Mediterranean Period in two parts, classical and medieval; The Atlantic Period, renaissance and modern; The World Period, international conflict and world co-operation. Two chapters have been added to the section on world co-operation in this new edition: The Utilization of Science, and Science for its Own Sake. They bring the story right up to date. There are tables which pick out, in parallel columns headed "Action", "Knowledge", "Vision", the figures and events which have affected each strand of civilization in the period under review. The selection repays study. The book ends with a Tennysonian challenge to go forward into a period of world co-operation, the answer to which "depends on the men and women of today, on their use of science, and on their receptivenes to beauty and humane feeling". Those who have to deal with liberal and high-minded adolescents should weigh carefully this admirable instance of indoctrination into a humane scientific attitude.

Dr. Raven's book is in the series *World Christian Books* published by the United Society for Christian Literature. The book expresses a vision, both of science and of Christianity, which is more private to Dr. Raven and to the disciples whom he is out to collect than is often acknowledged. That vision, like any in this field I suppose, is difficult to simplify. But in the four chapters on "Christ in this Changed World", "The Grace of Christ", "The Love of God" and "The Fellowship of the Holy Spirit", the writing achieves a degree of freshness and simplicity, and we are given the substance of that "fresh theological approach to the formulation of the faith" towards which the story of science points.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

The Psychic Message of the Scriptures. By T. ROWLAND POWEL. 83 pp. Omega Press, Reigate. 7s. 6d.

Spiritualism rests upon an understanding of the human person as tripartite: physical body, etheric body, and spirit. The etheric develops with the physical and interpenetrates it till the etheric umbilical cord between them is severed. This is the precise moment of death after which the physical body decays and the etheric, inhabited by the spirit, continues to interpenetrate the consciousness of people still living upon earth. Matter opposes spirit, yet both are understood in terms of vibrations.

To these categories certain miracles and spiritual phenomena of the New

Testament are submitted with interesting and strange result. The author's aim is to mediate between Spiritualist and Christian; his sincerity is unmistakable. The belief, however, that a Church enlightening men about the after-life would create a more willing audience for its ethical and spiritual message raises Father Abraham's dubiety concerning Dives' brethren of whom we are told: "neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." CONRAD BONIFAZI.

Dr. Nathaniel Micklem put us much in his debt in 1951 by producing a little book of daily offices for private devotional use called *Prayers and Praises*. A new and revised edition has now been published (Independent Press, 6s.). There has been some re-arrangement of material; a second hymn has been added to each office; and those who use this book will find it more convenient to have the evening service following the morning service for each day. The regular use of these offices, which contain so many of the great hymns and prayers of the Church, has already proved to be of real spiritual profit to many. The book is to be warmly commended to those not already familiar with it. An appendix indicating the proper tunes for the hymns has been added.

More than forty years ago Dr. W. E. Orchard, then a young Presbyterian minister, compiled, from material prepared for his own pulpit ministry, a little book called "The Temple: A Book of Prayers". These prayers were arranged "as for a gradual progress through the various sections of the Jewish Temple". No prayers, however, were provided for the "Holy of Holies". In his *Sancta Sanctorum: Prayers for the Holy of Holies* (J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 12s. 6d.) Dr. Orchard, now a Catholic priest, has supplied this lack. The language used is that of private meditation rather than of public liturgical prayer. Only in a few places (e.g. on page 156) do the author's Roman Catholic convictions make these prayers difficult for other Christians to use. "A Prayer for Priestly Coronation" can be especially commended to all ministers.

The Rev. T. S. Garrett, of Tamilnad Theological College, has written an Introduction to and Commenary on *The Liturgy of the Church of South India* of which a second edition, commenting on the 1954 revision of the liturgy, has now been published (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.). The first half of the book deals in general with the meaning of the Lord's Supper. Here there is a valuable section on "The Eucharistic Sacrifice" in which the position of the Prayer of Oblation is discussed. In the C.S.I. Liturgy "the self-offering of the people takes place after Communion." The second half of the book goes through the service in some detail and in doing so reveals the care and skill with which this admirable liturgy has been prepared. Not only those who are interested in this particular liturgy but all who are looking for a concise and reliable statement about the meaning of the service of Holy Communion in harmony with Reformed teaching are recommended to get this book.

A Devotional Commentary on The Shorter Oxford Bible by William J. Shergold (Independent Press, 12s. 6d.) reproduces material originally prepared at the request of the Lay Preaching Committee of the Congregational Union for the use of lay preachers taking non-examination courses of Bible study. Based on the best shortened version of the Bible which has yet appeared, these explanatory and expository notes, showing how the Bible is to be understood as the record of the People of God, will be found most helpful by lay preachers, teachers and other students of the Bible. Dr. Shergold's work bears the marks of careful scholarship, lucid exposition and a real love of the Scriptures. JAMES M. TODD.

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

The Life of Jesus Christ. By J. W. C. WAND. 184 pp. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

We are glad that Methuen's "Home Study" series edited by Ifor Evans has room for a Life of Jesus, and that the Bishop of London has written it. It tells the story plainly without any attempt at impressive writing, and achieves an impressiveness of its own. Material from all four Gospels is woven in skilfully. Dr. Wand tends to be conservative when critical points arise (e.g. the Transfiguration), but he affirms "we need a combination of faith and reason, and the two are not necessarily antagonistic". He has some very sound remarks in his treatment of the miracles generally. He writes with a restraint appropriate to the subject matter, and cannot be charged with being uncritical or merely sentimental or unduly imaginative. We are the more ready to take it from him when he points out that in the life of Jesus there is more than science or history can grasp, and we positively welcome the statement in the concluding chapter: "It is in the last resort impossible to write a life of Jesus without making it clear whether you believe Him to be the Son of God or not." E. C. BLACKMAN.

The Dialogues of Jesus. By CLAUDE CHAVASSE. 136 pp. Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

It has often been said that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a dramatist; and Mr. Chavasse has presented this Gospel in dramatic form. In the main it is in dialogue form, thus evading the repetitious "answered and said"; there are, of course, connecting narrative portions; certain explanatory phrases are relegated to footnotes; and such words as "seeing Nathanael coming unto him" appear as stage-directions. With a few exceptions, which are carefully noted in the Introduction, the text of the Revised Version is followed; and Mr. Chavasse has at certain points accepted some of the suggested rearrangements of the text of the Gospel. When he does so, he can cite good authority; but perhaps he has not sufficiently weighed the opinion that at best these rearrangements are merely conjectural. The author hopes that his work may be used in schools; and there can be little doubt that for many scholars "John" would come very much alive if introduced in this way.

The Message of Christianity. By PETER H. MONSMA. 124 pp. Bookman Associates, New York. $2.75.

Mr. Monsma provides a series of sermonic essays, bountifully interspersed with apposite quotations, which display his conviction "that the central tenets of Christianity need no abstruse or elaborate exposition." It is abundantly clear that the author has the courage of this conviction.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Daily Life of the Christian. By JOHN MURRAY. 127 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

In simple and practical fashion John Murray has drawn a pattern of living to show how the Christian may glorify God in some of the events and situations of life in our society: at work and leisure, in the cinema, and on Sunday. He writes about falling in love, being married and bringing up a family and, in the realm of social and political responsibility, discusses the use of money, the attitude of the Christian to the civic community, the

welfare state and loyalty to his country. The danger of this practical emphasis is to read into Christianity a utilitarian meaning, and so to abandon its absolute claims; but the chapters are bounded by an introduction and epilogue which show that the validity of the author's description of life rests upon a personal relationship of love between God and the believing man.

The Christian Duty of Happiness. By C. A. ALINGTON. 88 pp. Faber and Faber. 7s. 6d.

A failure to be fundamentally happy implies a failure of faith, according to Dr. Alington, who is anxious that the basic happiness underlying the Christian creed should never be allowed to disappear from view. It is not to be confounded with the gaiety which marks a sense of well-being, for it is a duty best defined by St. Paul who exhorts the Philippians to cheerfulness, forbearance and the prayerful committal of all anxious care to God in order that His peace may guard their hearts and thoughts. Dr. Alington contrasts a sombre with a joyous sense of duty in the persons of Wellington and Nelson; but they were men under orders, and in presupposing a knowledge of one's duty he appears not to take cognizance of the recurrent situation in which uncertainty of precise direction in duty diminishes our happiness in its execution. The book is felicitous in style, expert in the use of quotation, and delightful to read.

The Religious Quest. A study in the Development of the Religious Sentiment. By JOYCE KENWRICK. 167 pp. National Society and S.P.C.K. 15s. 6d.

Miss Kenwrick's work represents an exercise in the sympathetic understanding which is essential in helping young people to grapple with spiritual difficulties. As a lecturer in Divinity faced with the practical problems of religious education among students, she has collected and assessed the intimate religious histories of 338 persons in order to understand the emotional attitude which often hinders the spiritually hungry from assimilating the religious truth they need. The interest of the study is heightened by the fact that the investigation is not confined to one sect or religion but includes statements from members of Protestant bodies, Roman Catholics and the Eastern Orthodox Church, together with representatives of Islam and Judaism. One illuminating result is the similarity of religious problems confronting both Moslem and Christian. A discussion on two ways of knowing—by parable or catechism—is excellent. The immediate appeal of the book is to teachers of religion; it is to be hoped that it will reach a deservedly wider circle of readers.

A Retreat for Lay People. By RONALD KNOX. 246 pp. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

When you are in retreat, says Mgr. Knox, it is difficult to find *the* book you want; there is a daintiness in your spiritual tastes which calls for the meal *à la carte* rather than the *table d'hôte*. Consequently this volume makes no claim to organic unity, but is a sample collection of meditations given by the author during the past fifteen years. The menu is varied and excellent; it cannot fail to refresh and nourish the reader. The first group of meditations deals with the Christian's relationship to God, the second concerns the life and death of Christ, and the third envisages the practical needs of daily life. Mgr. Knox writes in the language of ordinary people; he can be amusing yet incisive, whimsical and profound; his book sets forth the love of God with attractive power, and with penetration it searches the heart. CONRAD BONIFAZI.

The Burden of the Lord. By IAN MACPHERSON. 147 pp. Epworth. 10s. 6d.

Here is yet another book on preaching. But it was well worth the writing, and can be cordially commended both to students leaving college and to those who have been many years in the ministry. Mr. Macpherson deals with his subject in four chapters: The Burden, The Man, The Craft, and The Encounter. This is a workmanlike division, and he has many wise things to say under each heading. He has read widely, and the book is packed with helpful quotations and references. The work is no mere compilation, however. The author has thought through every aspect of his subject, and the most experienced preacher will find much worth pondering.

On the vexed question of delivery, Mr. Macpherson takes the wise course of describing several methods—he considers there are four—and discussing their merits and defects. He lists the extemporary, the read, the recited, and the "fully written, but preached from notes". He cites great preachers who have used each of these methods. Very rightly, he condemns the extemporary method, except when emergency arises and we must do our best without chance of preparation. Otherwise, it is so likely to deserve Bottom's comment on the lion's part: "It can be done extempore, for it is only roaring". There have indeed been great readers and reciters, but for most men he commends the fourth method: write the sermon out in full, then prepare notes from it, and take only those into the pulpit. Each man must of course evolve his own method and style, but he will do wisely to ponder these views. It cannot be said of many books that they should be in the library of every student and minister. It can rightly be said of this one.

The Church Defies the Dark Ages. By DIANA LEATHAM. 120 pp. Religious Education Press. 5s. cloth, 4s. limp.

This is No. 6 in the excellent "Pathfinder Series", designed for senior classes in schools, but valuable for all young people and for older ones as well. This volume recounts the origins of Christianity in Britain, and tells of the fine work of the Celtic Church and of its influence on the continent of Europe. The exploits of men like Columba, Aidan, Ninian and Wilfrid are vividly recounted. This was a period rich in credulity, and legend as well as fact is set down. But the historical framework is clearly set out and the legends are assessed with competent judgment; it would have been a pity to leave them out, for many of them probably have more truth behind them than was at one time supposed. All honour to St. Augustine; but here we see what splendid Christian work had been done in these islands for centuries before 597.

A. R. VINE.

The Bond and the Free. By CHARLES DUNSCOMB. 190 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

So many modern novels about the beginning of Christianity are marred by sentimentalism that I opened "The Bond and the Free" in some trepidation. Was it to be the mixture made familiar in technicolour—miracles and martyrdoms and apostles larger than life, set against a background of Roman opulence and cruelty? As soon as I had read a few pages, my fears began to fade. Mr. Dunscomb describes real people, whether they be Roman officials or Jewish "natives". Lavinia, a niece of Pontius Pilate's wife, has much to write home about to Portia, her confidante in Rome. Through her eyes we catch glimpses of the trial of Christ, and the stoning of Stephen. Lavinia becomes the wife of a Roman official who is stationed for a time at Caesarea, and some years later is posted to Philippi. Her slow spiritual growth is sensitively portrayed. Mr. Dunscomb has succeeded in bringing to life the period in which the Gospel was first preached. He has

the power of evoking a scene or a person in a few telling words. He revives the original form of the English novel by using letters to tell his story. And what interesting letters they are! This is a most promising first novel. I hope that the author, who is a candidate for the Christian ministry, will somehow find time to write more.

A Diary of Readings, gathered by JOHN BAILLIE. 385 pp. Oxford University Press. 15s.

Dr. Baillie has ransacked the treasuries of the Christian centuries to compile this book. Here, standing side by side, are extracts from the writings of St. Augustine and A. N. Whitehead, St. Athanasius and Reinhold Niebuhr; Catholic and Protestant, theologian and mystic all contribute to this rich and satisfying anthology. The range of thought is immense, and yet the book has a unity which saves it from being just a series of unrelated extracts. All these writers are saying something about their deepest experience of reality. However much the size or shape of their mirror may vary, it is the same light which they are reflecting. All who read this book will be grateful to Dr. Baillie for laying before them so much varied food for mind and spirit.

Damien the Leper. By JOHN FARROW. 230 pp. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

Many of us first heard of Father Damien through reading Robert Louis Stevenson's open letter to the Rev. Dr. Hyde. Stevenson, it will be remembered, flayed the reverend gentleman for having described Damien as "a coarse, dirty man, headstrong and bigoted" who was "not pure in his relations with women". After reading this life of Damien I can understand better the violence of Stevenson's anger. Damien's courage and devotion were beyond praise. He went voluntarily into what amounted to life imprisonment, knowing that in the end he was almost certain to become a leper himself. He was no plaster saint, but a real man who was often difficult to work with and a thorn in the side of the authorities. His aggressiveness, however, was only the other side of the strong determination which enabled him to do a task from which most men shrank. Mr. Farrow writes in a vivid style which sometimes descends into journalese, but he is always clear and usually interesting.

Smoke on the Mountain. By JOY DAVIDMAN. 125 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. Cloth 7s. 6d., Paper 4s. 6d.

"Joy Davidman", writes C. S. Lewis in his foreword, "is one who comes to us from the second generation of unbelief; her parents, Jewish in blood, were rationalists by conviction". A convert to Christianity from such a background, who is also a poet and novelist, was bound to have something worthwhile to say when she began to write about religion. Nor does she disappoint our expectations. In this book she writes about the Ten Commandments with insight into their meaning, and with understanding of the fears and sins of the modern world. She sees how when "the common good" was put in the place of God "anti-social behaviour" outmoded sin. She writes with a vigour which carries on the reader's attention from page to page. Some may dislike the American type of wisecrack to which she is partial, e.g. "We are still often seeking God . . . so that we can hire him as a nightwatchman to Mammon", but one English reader at any rate found her unconventional way of writing theology most refreshing. This is an incisive, amusing and thought-provoking book.

In *Pipe-Line of Power* (Religious Education Press, 4s.) F. W. King writes a graphic history of the Jews in 94 pages. His book records the racy conversation of a schoolmaster who is not afraid to be "matey" with his

boys, and should prove useful for the "Scouts' Own" or the Boys' Brigade Bible Class.

In *Talks for Young Church Members* (Epworth, 5s.) William J. May tries to put gallons and gallons into a pint pot! In a mere 78 pages he expounds The Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes and the Creed. Yet in his limited space he often manages to say things pithy and true.

CHARLES HAIG.

Padre Brown of Gibraltar by E. R. Taylor (Epworth Press, 5s.) is the Memoir of an individualist who was happy enough to find his niche. Brown was destined for the China Inland Mission but became a Wesleyan Army Chaplain in India. During the First World War he won the D.S.O. in France. He found it hard to settle to circuit work in England but in 1922 he had the chance to return to Gibraltar, where he had been 1907-12. In this tiny parish, three miles long and one mile wide, he ministered for 29 years until he became an institution. His period of service covered the years of the Spanish Civil War and of the Second World War. It was in such times that the goodness and greatness of the man came out and it is good to have it so faithfully put on record.

Letters to a Christian by H. Trevor Hughes (Epworth Press, paper, 6d.) sets out to answer in letter form the questions which are raised by a beginner in the Christian life, "How can I be sure? How can I witness? How can I develop as a Christian?" etc. This reprinted pamphlet has done and will do good.

In the same series comes *Jonah* by R. J. Anglin Johnson (9d.). This is a sound discussion of the book in short compass. On p. 11 it gives the old, incorrect date for the fall of Nineveh, 606 B.C., which should be corrected to 612 B.C.

The Banner of Love (Salvationist Press, paper, 2s.) by Catherine Baird is a well-written, well-printed little book on the Army Flag, its meaning, value and dramatic place in Army history. *The Soldier* by the same author (Salvationist Press, 4s. 6d.) is the story of Mary Angus. Born in Australia of Army parents, Mary grew into the service of Christ and men. She was called to S. Africa after the Boer War and there, sometimes in want and peril, always in terrible toil, she and her husband fought the war against evil.

This Shining Day (Hodder and Stoughton, 8s. 6d.) by Cecil Hunt is a day-book of saints. The story of a saint is briefly told for each day and is followed by one or two short appropriate quotations. In spite of the pathetic credulity which any mention of saints seems to call forth from certain folk, the result is a book of considerable interest and usefulness: and it is beautifully produced.

A very helpful book for those who conduct worship for children aged 5-7 in Day or Sunday Schools is *Morning Worship for Young Children* by A. T. King (Independent Press, paper, 2s.). A subject, outline talk, reading, hymns and prayer are suggested for 41 days.

Tell Me about Jesus (J. F. Shaw and Co., 5s.) by Mary Littlefair is a Life of Jesus for nursery reading. It opens, surprisingly, with two difficult chapters on the Godhead and thereafter follows conventional enough lines. Opinion on the illustrations will differ. A conventional haloed Jesus is surprisingly surrounded by figures of a living modernity. Might that not give an entirely wrong impression to a child?

Once again we note a useful reprint of a Lift Up Your Hearts series, *Perplexing Parables* by W. Gordon Robinson (Independent Press, paper, 1s.). Here is first-class Bible exposition in crisp, modern idiom.

JOHN WILDING.

MISCELLANEA

Selection Two. A Yearbook of Contemporary Thought. Edited by CECILY HASTINGS and DONALD NICHOLL. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

This book is a successor to Selection I published in 1953 and, like the first volume, consists of a selection of essays by eminent Roman Catholics. If there is any connection between them which gives the volume a unity, it is the theme of symbolism in one form or another. Of the essays which have clearly to do with symbolism Prof. Mircea Eliade's "Symbolism of the Centre", a contribution to the study of symbolical archetypes in religion, is perhaps the most important. The volume includes an essay by Dr. Gregory Zilboorg on "Love in Freudian Psychoanalysis", an account by Karl Buchheim of Luther's struggle, attributing Luther's revolt from the Mass and the experiences which brought about his breach with the Church to the result of his unwillingness to become monk and priest. The broadcast talk by David Jones on "Wales and the Crown" I found, I must confess, somewhat elusive and difficult to follow, though this, too, has its place in the volume among the essays with symbolism as their theme. Father Oskar Simmel's "Myth and Gospel" contains some sensible comments on Bultmann and, like Gogarten in his *Entmythologisierung und Kirche*, perceives the relevance of Bultmann's idea of the historical to the question of demything along existential lines. For Simmel there is no question of demything, as the New Testament's truth is guaranteed by God. There can therefore be no argument about it. Not all the essays have a noticeably Catholic colouring, and the volume, with its predecessor, indicates the kind of thinking which is being done by Catholics and which is inaccessible to most people.

GERAINT V. JONES.

British Institutions (O.U.P., 6s. 6d.) by Messrs. W. E. Tate and C. H. C. Blount is a recent addition to the 'History through the Ages' series of educational text-books. Each book in this series is calculated to form the basis of history lessons for a year and, being self-contained, may also be used by children as a simple reference book. The account of local government in the present volume centres round the imaginary village of 'Billingham' in 'Cherry Tree hundred' in the county of 'Linford'. This is followed by chapters on central government, while a third and final section deals with the armed forces, the Co-operatives and the Trade Unions. This section includes a chapter on the churches.

First novels by authors still in their teens no longer surprise us. We have had, perhaps, too many of them. But a readable first novel written after the age of retirement is more unusual. Mr. J. Edward Newton, a Londoner by birth, went to the United States at the age of 21. After 50 years as a Congregational minister at Westville, New Haven, Connecticut, he resigned and, among other activities, took to writing. He has now published his first essay in fiction. *The Rogue and the Witch* (Abelard-Schuman, New York, $3.50), set in New England at the time of the "witch hunts", is a romantic novel based on historical fact. John Henniker, a Puritan minister, comes to the American colonies as assistant to Increase Mather. He falls in love with Glory Upshall, a Quaker girl. On this account and because of his advanced theological opinion he falls foul of the Puritan community of Boston and is tried, convicted and sentenced to death as a witch. He escapes from jail and after many vicissitudes marries Glory and retires with her to an island retreat. The reader familiar with present-day "witch hunts" in America will not fail to draw certain parallels. This is a well-told story.

P. A. SPALDING.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (April) includes 'L. P. Jacks: Some Personal Memories' by Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas; 'The Present Relations between Eastern and Western Philosophy' by Prof. H. H. Price; 'Carlyle on Muhammad' by Dr. Montgomery Watt; 'The Cambridge Platonists' by Rev. A. W. Argyle; 'Age and Achievement' by Prof. Ceza Revesz; 'Ends and Means in Education' by Prof. E. B. Castle.

International Review of Missions (April) includes 'The Church and the Faculty' by Rev. F. B. Welbourne; 'Language and Theology in Africa' by Rev. H. von Sicard; 'Crosses and Angels from 14th century China' by Prof. John Foster; 'P. T. Forsyth's Theology of Missions' by Rev. Douglas Webster; 'Where should Missionary Recruits be Trained?' by Rev. A. H. Dammers; 'Israel at Evanston' by Rev. Robert Smith.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April) is mainly devoted to the study of missionary methods in history and throughout the world, in Britain, U.S.A., China, Australia and Europe. It includes also 'Religion as Worship' by Prof. T. E. Jessop; 'The Heresy of Fundamentalism' by Rev. A. Gordon James.

Baptist Quarterly (Jan.) includes 'Recent Trends in the Theology of Baptism' by Rev. A. Gilmore; 'Feisser and the Rise of the Netherlands Baptists' by Dr. Jan A. Brandsma; 'Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism' (cont.) by Dr. W. Morris West.

Friends' Quarterly (April) includes 'The Quaker Message; Unique or Universal' by Douglas V. Steere; 'The Contribution of Friends to Education Today' by Gerald Littleboy; 'From Dependence to Independence' (in the Sudan) by Robin A. Hodgkin.

The Modern Churchman (March) includes 'E. W. Barnes—The Man for the Moment' by Dr. C. E. Raven; 'The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man' by Very Rev. George Seaver; 'Modernist Movements in Hinduism' by Dr. E. C. Dewick; 'Spiritualism and Christian Faith' by Rev. D. L. Scott; 'According to the Scriptures' by the Editor.

Evangelical Quarterly (April) includes 'Nahum, Nineveh, Elkosh' by Prof. O. T. Allis; 'Myth and Symbol in Religious Thought' by Rev. H. P. V. Nunn; 'The Main Themes of Alexander Whyte' by Rev. Peter Davidson; 'Angels' by Gordon Chilvers.

Theology (March) includes 'Preaching as Corporate Worship' by Dr. F. D. Coggan; 'Anglican Religious Communities' by Rev. R. L. Wrathall. (April) 'Is Christianity Intelligible?' by Rev. R. Gregor Smith; 'The Image of Moses in the Synoptics' by Rev. Barnabas Lindars.

Expository Times (March) includes 'Suggestions on Preaching the New Testament' by Dr. A. A. Cowan; 'The Mari Letters' by Cyril J. Gadd; 'The Injunctions of Silence in Mark's Gospel' by Dr. J. W. Leitch. (April) 'The Mari Letters' (cont.) by Cyril J. Gadd; 'Karl Barth' by Dr. T. F. Torrance; 'The Two Circles of Faith' by Dr. F. J. Rae.

Harvard Theological Review (Oct. 1954) includes two long essays, 'A Gentleman among the Fathers' (Clement of Alexandria) by Dr. Morton S. Enslin; 'The Development of Augustine's Ideas on Society' by Dr. F. Edward Cranz.

Review of Religion (March) includes 'Eastern Sage to Western Man' by Prof. George Weston Briggs; 'Confidence and the Will to Power' by Prof. James Gutmann; 'The Nature of Religious Propositions' by Prof. Paul L. Holmer. There are 75 pages of book reviews.

Huntington Library Quarterly (February) includes 'Dryden's "Memorable Visit" to Milton' by Morris Freedman; '*Préciosité* and the Restoration Comedy of Manners' by Prof. David S. Berkeley; 'The Grenville Mission to Berlin, 1799' by Prof. D. C. Elliot.

The Yale Review (Spring) includes 'American Policy and Preventive War' by Henry A. Kissinger; 'Australia; America's Uneasy Ally' by Prof. Nathaniel Peffer; 'The North African in France' by David S. McLellan; 'Towards an American Conservatism' by Clinton Rossiter.

Theology Today (April) includes 'Horace Bushnell's Doctrine of Depravity' by Prof. E. Clinton Garndner; 'Are there Tests of Revelation' by Prof. John C. Bennett; 'Freedom, Truth and Unity' by Roland H. Bainton. J. M. P.